



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>


AN APPEAL
IN BEHALF OF THE
VIEWS OF THE ETERNAL WORLD AND STATE,
AND THE
DOCTRINES OF FAITH AND LIFE,
Held by the Body of Christians who believe that a
NEW CHURCH,
is signified (in the Revelation, Chapter XXI.) by the
NEW JERUSALEM,
EMBRACING
ANSWERS TO ALL PRINCIPAL OBJECTIONS,

BY THE REV. S. NOBLE,
Minister of the New Jerusalem Church, Cross Street, Hatton Garden, London.

~~~~~  
"For we have not followed cunningly devised fables. 2 Peter i. 16.  
"Beware, therefore, lest that come upon you which is spoken of in the prophets; Behold ye despisers, and wonder and perish: for I work a work in your days, a work which ye shall in no wise believe, though a man declare it unto you." Acts xiii. 40, 41; Hab. i. 5.  
~~~~~

SECOND EDITION.

ENTIRELY RE-MODELED AND MUCH ENLARGED.



NEW YORK:

PUBLISHED BY JOHN ALLEN.


1851.

BX 8721
N6

NOTICE.

THE present Edition of this Work is a reprint entire of the last English Edition, without alteration or omission.

**THURSTON & CO., STEREOTYPERS,
PORTLAND, ME.**



PREFACE.

THE occasion and design of the following work are sufficiently explained in the Introductory Section; it is therefore unnecessary to say anything on those subjects here.

In the former Edition, to save room, a large portion of the matter was thrown into the form of Notes; and a further portion was printed in very small type as an *Appendix*. Considerable inconvenience, however, resulted from this arrangement; and when a new edition was called for, a very general wish was expressed that the Notes should be incorporated with the Text. This, therefore, with some exceptions, has now been done.

If, however, the arrangement adopted in the first Edition had its inconveniencies, it perhaps had its conveniences also. As remarked in the Preface to that Edition, those who prefer small books to large, especially on theological subjects, might, by that arrangement, gratify their taste, by confining their reading to the Text alone: if this should sufficiently interest them to raise a further appetite, they could then, if they pleased, read the Notes also. To retain, in the present Edition, an equivalent advantage, all the longer SECTIONS have been subdivided into distinct PARTS, each PART dis-

cussing some principal branch of the general subject of the SECTION. The whole work is thus divided into portions of moderate length, affording breaks at which the reader may conveniently pause. Readers, also, who would be alarmed at the idea of having to read so large a volume all through, may at first confine their perusal to those PARTS, in the subjects of which, as expressed by their titles, they feel most interest; and, if pleased with these, they can extend their reading further. But the Author hopes that none will conclude, from the perusal of *some PARTS alone*, that he has failed to establish his points; since the subject and argument of each PART of a SECTION usually receives light and confirmation from the rest; and the SECTIONS themselves, also, are similarly connected with each other.

In the present Edition, as little as possible of the personal matter respecting the Rev. Mr. Beaumont, whose publication, entitled *The Anti-Swedenborg*, originally occasioned the composition of this work, has been retained. But the work being framed, as a principal object, to meet the common arguments and objections against the New Church, in the form in which those arguments and objections are stated in the *Anti-Swedenborg*, it was neither possible nor desirable to divest it of the form it had thus assumed. Mention of the *Anti-Swedenborg* and its objections is therefore retained; but only as a convenient formulary for objectors and objections in general.

Besides the alteration of the form of this work in the present Edition by incorporating the Notes, large quantities of additional matter have been introduced. The Sections, in particular, on the Trinity, the Atonement, and the Christian Life, which, in the former Edition, to keep the whole within the prescribed limits, were greatly contracted, are now ex-

panded to dimensions more in proportion to the other Sections, and less incommensurate with the importance of their subjects. Other large additions have also been interspersed throughout. By adopting a larger paper and a smaller type, nearly twice as much is contained in a page as in the text of the former edition ; while the number of pages is nearly the same.

Of the APPENDIX to the former Edition, there has only been retained the Article, No. 1, *Various Particulars relating to Heaven and Hell, &c., Explained*. The subjects of this Article are not sufficiently general to be introduced in the work itself ; yet it will be found, on perusal, more completely to take away the ground of many common objections made against the writings of Swedenborg, and to evince that those writings contain no statements whatever, which cannot be rationally vindicated. Most of the other portions of the former Appendix have been incorporated in the work itself. One additional Article has been introduced, on a charge often brought against the New Church, — that of Sabellianism. This would very properly have made a portion of the work itself ; but the part in which it might have come in was completed before its introduction was thought of. The subject being important, the reader is requested not to overlook it where it stands.

On the whole, this APPEAL, in this Edition, has, as stated in the Title, been entirely re-modelled, and greatly enlarged ; it is hoped that it is proportionally improved. It has been brought out in compliance with a request of the Twenty-sixth General Conference of the New Church, a resolution of which declares, “ That this Conference is glad to have the opportunity afforded it of bearing testimony to the extensive uses that have been performed by the work in question, which

has been fully proved, as stated at a former Conference, to 'afford valuable assistance to those who are desirous of vindicating their faith, and of opposing the influence of error and misrepresentation;' and is known to have been the means of introducing many to an acceptance of the doctrines of the New Church, and of settling the minds of others who were wavering as to their reception." The Author is truly thankful that his work has thus been owned of Him, from whom all pure Truth, and all that is really Good, proceeds; and that it has also been so favorably accepted by his brethren. That the present Edition may be still further blessed in the same way,—may be instrumental in bringing many souls into, or of establishing them in, the true way of eternal life,—and that many may feel cause to be thankful in eternity that they had been led to peruse it; will be his continual prayer.

CONTENTS.

SECTION I.

INTRODUCTION, - - - - -	PAGE 9
-------------------------	-----------

SECTION II.

THE SECOND COMING OF THE LORD, - - - - -	14
--	----

SECTION III.

THE RESURRECTION,

Part I.—The True Doctrine Proposed, and Texts cited in Opposition considered, - - - - -	42
Part II.—Other Texts commonly regarded as adverse to the True Doctrine, considered, - - - - -	63
Part III.—The Testimony of Reason, for, and against the Resurrection of the Material Body, - - - - -	81
Part IV.—Scripture Evidence of the True Doctrine, - - - - -	100

SECTION IV.

THE LAST JUDGMENT,

Part I.—The Last Judgment of the Scriptures was not to be accomplished in the Natural World, - - - - -	127
Part II.—The Spiritual World the Scene of it; as of all former General Judgments, - - - - -	147
Part III.—An Intermediate World and State the Specific Scene of all General and Particular Judgments, - - - - -	158
Part IV.—The Last Judgment actually accomplished, - - - - -	177

SECTION V.

A HUMAN INSTRUMENT NECESSARY AND THEREFORE RAISED UP.

Part I.—Swedenborg qualified to be such an Instrument, and not unlikely to be chosen, - - - - -	195
Part II.—Specific Evidences to the Qualifications of Swedenborg, and to the Truth of his Claims, - - - - -	208
Part III.—The objection That Swedenborg performed no Miracles, considered, - - - - -	234
Part IV.—The Charge against Swedenborg of Mental Derangement, considered, with some Minor Objections, - - - - -	257

SECTION VI.

HEAVEN AND HELL; AND THE APPEARANCES IN THEM, AND IN THE INTERMEDIATE REGION, OR WORLD OF SPIRITS.

PART I.—The Human Instrument for opening the Truths to be revealed at the Lord's Second Advent, should be enabled to remove the Prevailing Darkness on these Subjects, - - - - -	297
Part II.—The Inhabitants of Heaven and Hell, are all from the Human Race, - - - - -	301
Part III.—All Swedenborg's Statements respecting the Spiritual World are perfectly Reasonable and Scriptural, when certain Truths, relating to that World, are known, - - - - -	320
Part IV.—The Existence of the Marriage-Union in Heaven, and of an Opposite Connection in Hell, - - - - -	330

Part V. — Other Circumstances in Heaven, Hell, and the World of Spirits, different from what is usually conceived, - - -	350
Part VI. — Swedenborg's General Views respecting Heaven and Hell, obviously agreeable to Reason and Scripture, - - -	367

SECTION VII.

THE TRINITY, AS CENTERED IN THE PERSON OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST.

Part I. — The General Doctrine stated, and established by Scripture, - - -	375
Part II. — All Objections to the Doctrine fall to the ground, when certain Truths are known relating to the Lord as the Son of God, and the Glorification of his Humanity, - - -	389
Part III. — Tritheism the alternative of the True Doctrine of the Trinity, - - -	401
Part IV. — The True Doctrine confirmed from the Texts most relied on for the proof of the contrary, - - -	418

SECTION VIII.

THE ATONEMENT, SACRIFICE, AND MEDIATION OF JESUS CHRIST.

Part I. — Atonement in General, and Atonement by Sacrifices, especially by the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ, - - -	445
Part II. — Other Modes of Atonement, besides that by Sacrifices, mentioned in Scripture, - - -	465
Part III. — The Mediation of Jesus Christ, - - -	478

SECTION IX.

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.

Part I. — The New Church Doctrine of Life, a Doctrine of Genuine Holiness, - - -	487
Part II. — Holiness, not Laxity, encouraged by the sentiment, That it is not so difficult to live the Life that leads to Heaven as some suppose, - - -	496
Part III. — Charity not infringed by Swedenborg's Exposure of the Errors of a Perverted Church, - - -	507

APPENDIX.

No. I. — SECT. VI. — PART V.

Various Particulars relating to Heaven and Hell, &c., Explained, - - -	521
--	-----

No. II. — SECT. VII. — PART IV.

The New Church Doctrine of the Trinity not a revival of Sabellianism, or any other Ancient Heresy, - - -	536
--	-----



AN APPEAL, &c.

TO THE REFLECTING OF ALL DENOMINATIONS.

SECTION I.

INTRODUCTION.

MEN AND BRETHREN!

ALLOW me, with respect and affection, to address you, as persons who assign their due value to serious things, on a subject of, as it appears to many, no inconsiderable importance.

The existence of a body of Christians who humbly trust that they belong to the New Church of the Lord, predicted in various parts of the Holy Scriptures, and called, in the twenty-first chapter of the Revelation, the New Jerusalem, has, for some time past, attracted a considerable degree of public attention. It is generally known that the Views of the Eternal World and State, and the Doctrines of Faith and Life, held by these persons, are those which are delivered, as deductions from the Word of God, in the writings of the Hon. Emanuel Swedenborg; who is by them regarded as a distinguished servant of the Lord, raised up for this work by as express an interference of Divine Providence, as that by which a Luther was raised to effect the Reformation from the corruptions of the Church of Rome, or even as that by which a Paul was called forth to teach the great truths of Christianity itself, or a John the Baptist to announce the first advent of its Divine Author. But while it has thus been known that such a body of Christians exists, and that such is the origin of their views and doctrines, the greatest misapprehension in general prevails as to what those views and doctrines are, and the grounds on which they are embraced: for, unhappily, they have been heard of by the public at large, only, for the most part, through the misrepresentations and perversions of adversaries. We, who have embraced them, feel an entire but humble assurance, that, were they seen in their true colors, all the Reflecting, of all

Denominations, would immediately admit, that they are worthy at least of deep consideration and serious attention; and we are assured further, that, were such consideration and attention bestowed on them, numbers would rise from the investigation with a conviction of their truth. *If they are true*, to have just or erroneous conceptions of them cannot be a matter of indifference: permit then one of those who have not hesitated to stake their salvation upon their certainty, to address a serious Appeal to you in their behalf. Great activity has been used, through a great variety of channels, to possess your minds with totally false and extremely injurious conceptions respecting the illustrious Swedenborg and his writings: allow, therefore, I entreat you, one who has maturely considered both, to disabuse you respecting them,—to disperse, by a fair statement, the clouds of misrepresentation in which the sentiments received by us have been involved,—and to bring to your acquaintance views of Divine Truth, which appear to us to be at once elevated and well-founded; views which, we venture to assure you, challenge the strictest scrutiny of Reason, and come supported by the plainest testimony of Scripture. Yes, ye who prize the inestimable gift of Reason! permit me to say, that never was a more gross deception practised on mankind, than when it has been attempted, by idle tales and false imputations, to make you believe, that Reason, and what is commonly, but improperly, termed Swedenborgianism, are uncombinable terms. And to you, ye sincere lovers of the Scriptures! allow me to declare, that to persuade you that writings and doctrines like those we espouse, which place the truths of Scripture in their own genuine light, are at variance with the truths of Scripture, and that they originate in delusion, is to impose on you an extravagant delusion indeed.

Were I left to my own choice in regard to the form which this Appeal should assume, it would be different from that which I am compelled by circumstances to adopt. Having a rich store from which to make my selection of the most luminous truths and most satisfactory doctrines, upon every subject that is interesting to a man, to an immortal, to a Christian, I naturally should give to the most important things, the largest share of attention, bestowing a more cursory notice on matters of inferior moment. There are no sentiments entertained by us, or advanced in the writings of Swedenborg, which we are not satisfied are pure and genuine truths: but in every extended system of doctrine there are truths of higher and of lower importance; as in the system of the visible heavens “one star differeth from another star in glory;” and as the representative breast-plate of Aaron not only included the ruby and the dia-

mond, but also the agate and the jasper. In making then an Appeal to you in behalf of our views, were I left to pursue the most natural course, I undoubtedly should place the richer gems, the rubies and the diamonds, in the more prominent light, and give to the inferior a subordinate station. The great truths respecting the Nature, Person, and Attributes, of the Lord God Almighty; the work of Human Redemption; the duties of Repentance and Reformation; the process of Regeneration; the entire Inspiration and exalted Spirituality of the Word of God; the certainty of a Future Retribution; the true Importance of the Present Stage of Existence as that in which man makes up the form and character of his spirit and internal life, and thus fixes his state, either for happiness or misery, to eternity; the pure Glories of Heaven, and the real Terrors of Hell; the Wonders of the Divine Government, or of Divine Providence, which extends to the minutest occurrences of human life, and in all that it either appoints or permits, primarily regards eternal ends:—these, and, such as these, are the subjects which occupy the distinguished stations in the doctrines which we believe to be those of the New Jerusalem, and in the writings in which those doctrines are delivered: on these they present views which are indisputably heavenly and exalted: on these then the pen of an Apologist would naturally dwell at the greatest length and with the most delight, secure that in all which he should offer respecting them the mind of the unprejudiced reader could scarcely fail of finding the most decided satisfaction. But they who have set themselves to crush, if it were possible, the rising New Church in its infancy,—as Herod sent to slay all the children of Bethlehem of two years old and under,—naturally take the opposite course. Some of them, indeed, as the late Dr. Priestly and a few others, have undertaken to oppose the leading doctrines of our church by argument; but the greater number have endeavored to keep our real doctrines, as far as possible, out of sight, offering, and then combating, such a garbled statement of them, as can give their readers no just idea of what they are; while they have ransacked the pages of our valued Author in quest of every thing which, on being brought forward by itself, separated from its context, and from the explanations necessary to its right apprehension, might appear most repugnant to the ideas commonly entertained of religious truth, and might with most plausibility be made the ground of opprobrious animadversion; especially when heightened by exaggeration and misstatement, which have often been supplied accordingly; not to mention the many absolute fictions, void of all foundation either in truth or in probability, which have been propagated respecting

Swedenborg, his writings, and their admirers. In appealing to you then in behalf of our sentiments, it is necessary to follow the course marked out by our opponents; and as they have endeavored to raise prejudices by chiefly dwelling upon parts of our author's system and writings which are of very inferior importance, I shall be obliged to give, to such subordinate points, a much larger proportion of attention than they otherwise would demand. I shall take then for my guide, as to the subjects necessary to be discussed and to be set in their true light, a publication by the Rev. G. Beaumont, of Norwich, which he denominates "The Anti-Swedenborg: or a Declaration of the Principal Errors and Anti-scriptural Doctrines contained in the Theological Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg." My chief reasons for giving my Appeal a particular reference to this publication, are, first, because it is a tolerably complete condensation of all the topics of objection ever raised against our views and doctrines; and secondly, because this work has been the occasion of many misrepresentations of our sentiments and of ourselves in the theological Reviews and Magazines, the editors of several of which, taking it for granted that Mr. Beaumont's reports and views are correct, have recommended his work, have repeated his statements, and thus have given a wide circulation to the injurious impression he has labored to excite. As observed above, had I chosen my own ground in this Appeal, the form of it would have been different from that which, under the existing circumstances, it will assume: but the advocates of the New Church, though without any confidence in themselves, are at all times willing, conscious of the invulnerability, in every point, of their sacred cause, to leave the choice of the ground to their opponents, and to meet them in any line of attack they may think proper to adopt. To legitimate argument (though it is seldom, alas! that any thing of that kind is employed against us), we hope to be enabled to oppose legitimate argument from sounder premises; to misrepresentations of facts or sentiments, the statement of such facts or sentiments in their proper colors; to misapplications of Scripture, Scripture justly applied and fairly explained; and to the artifices of falsehood, the honesty of truth. But we will not return railing for railing; nor, because the most scandalous imputations have been fabricated to be fixed on us, will we retort with any thing of the kind against our accusers. We commit the whole cause, with perfect composure as to the issue, into the hands of HIM whose cause we believe it to be; and while we are grateful that we have been enabled to behold the truth, on subjects of the deepest importance to human welfare, in, as we are satis-

fied, its own genuine light, we will not be offended with those who as yet see differently, nor cherish the smallest spark of personal ill-feeling towards the bitterest of our opponents. They, as well as we, are in the hands of a merciful God, who, as our doctrines assure us, does not visit with severity for involuntary, much less for well-intentioned error: and though we cannot but believe that our adversaries, especially when they misrepresent and malign us, are in error, we strive to cherish the hope, in every case where there is any possible ground for it, that the error is involuntary and well-intentioned.

Beside occasional notices of other assailants, I intend then in the following pages, for the reasons stated above, to answer all the objections raised in the work above mentioned. I do not propose, however, to follow the author's steps in a servile or captious manner, or to keep him or his objections constantly before the reader. My design rather is, to take occasion, from his strictures, to open, upon general principles, the subjects brought under discussion; so that this Appeal may include a general exposition of the sentiments of the New Church upon the most important of her doctrines, and especially upon those subjects, even when of quite inferior moment in themselves, in regard to which the most common and plausible objections have been raised, and the most injurious misconceptions have gone abroad.

I entreat you, then, my serious friends, to whatever denomination as regards the profession of religion, you may belong, to enter on the perusal of this appeal with candid minds, and with a sincere desire to see the truth, wheresoever, and with whomsoever, it may be found. As the best preparation for thus seeing it, allow me to request you to raise your hearts, in prayer for right direction and illumination, to the Truth Itself Impersonated, the Lord Jesus Christ. We are assured in his unerring Word, that He is "the true Light which lighteth every man, that cometh into the world*;" He declares, himself, that he is "the Truth†," and again, that He is "the Light of the world," and that "he that followeth *Him* shall not abide in darkness, but shall have the light of life‡:" whatsoever then may be your present opinions in regard to his nature and person, you cannot doubt, if you believe the Scriptures, that he has the power of imparting the light of truth to the mind that looks to him for it. Nor can you doubt, that, to the reception of any gift from him, faith in his power to confer it is a necessary preliminary. When the two blind men entreated his mercy, while on earth, He said unto them, "Believe ye that I am able to do this?" and on their answering in the

* John i. 9. † Ch. xiv. 6. ‡ Ch. viii. 12.

affirmative, "then touched He their eyes, saying, According to your faith be it unto you. And," the sacred record adds, "their eyes were opened."* Who does not see the correspondence between the communication of the light of day to the eye and of the light of truth to the mind? and that the one miracle was performed to represent the other? Whatever then may be thought of the Lord Jesus Christ, evident it is that He is set forth to us in the Scriptures as the Being from whom the inestimable gift of the perception of divine truth is to be received; and that, in order to its reception, He is to be applied to with confidence in his power to bestow it. Be your ideas of Him then, in other respects, what they may, permit me to beg you to believe, that He really has this power; to elevate your hearts towards Him with corresponding desires; and in this frame of mind to weigh the statements and considerations, which in the following Sections of this Appeal, will be laid before you. Under this guidance, I cannot refrain from hoping, that you will be led to the conclusion, that what our opponents call "principal errors," are in reality momentous truths, and that what they denominate "anti-scriptural doctrines" are in fact the very doctrines of the Scriptures. But do not let the fear of being brought to this result, by the devout experiment which I have presumed to recommend, deter you from making it: do not refuse to put your minds, on this occasion, under the sole guidance of the Lord Jesus Christ, from an apprehension, that He who is THE LIGHT and THE TRUTH, may by any possibility, guide you into error.

SECTION II.

THE SECOND COMING OF THE LORD.

I will call your attention, my reflecting brethren, in the first place to the important circumstance announced to us in the prophetic parts of the New Testament, and commonly known by the name of the Second Coming of the Lord; with the important consequence of such coming, or rather part of it, which is described in the symbolic language as the descent from heaven of a New Jerusalem. For it is because we understand these great predictions in a different sense from that in which most persons at the present time apprehend them, and because we believe that, in their only true sense, they are at this day receiving their fulfillment, that so many attempts are made to hold up both us and our sentiments to derision. In this respect

*Matt. x. 28, 29, 30.

we are treated just as were the first converts to Christianity by the Jews. The Jews were looking for the coming of the Messiah, as the hope of Israel; yet were they almost unanimous in persecuting the small band of their brethren, who affirmed that their hope was fulfilled. Christians have ever been looking with hope for the second coming of Him whom the Jews rejected: yet are too many of them eager in the persecution of those, who affirm that this hope also is fulfilled. To our case then may be most exactly applied the noble apology of Paul when pleading before Agrippa. "I stand," says he, "and am judged, for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers: unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come. For which hope's sake, king Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews."*

I propose, then, in this Section of my Appeal, to undertake the defence of those who stand in the same situation among their brethren, the professors of Christianity, as the Apostle Paul and the other first Christians did among their brethren, the professors of Judaism: and I earnestly intreat you, as believers of the Scriptures—as holders of the Christian's hope, candidly to consider what I have to offer. There is nothing in the sentiments I shall present which ought to offend any one, but, on the contrary, much that every one may regard with delight. If by any means prejudices have been instilled into the minds of any of you, permit me to request you to lay them aside till you have fairly heard both sides of the question; and pray do not consider me as your enemy, because, with much respect and affection, and without intending the smallest offence to any one, I lay before you what, from the bottom of my soul, I believe to be the truth.

First, then, I propose to show, That the second coming of the Lord is not a coming in person (as most persons in consequence of taking quite literally the symbolic language of prophecy, have hitherto supposed), but that it means the restoration of the true knowledge of divine subjects, or of the genuine doctrines of the word of God, accompanied with their corresponding influence on the heart; in other words, that it is the revival of the true church of the Lord among mankind; in which mode of considering it, it is more particularly meant by the manifestation of the New Jerusalem. In the second place, I will show, That there are many circumstances and signs in the situation of the world at this day, which plainly indicate that the time for the divine interference described in Scripture as the second coming of the Lord has arrived. In the third place I will point out, That there are circumstances in the state

* Acts, xxvi. 6, 7.

of the world at this day in regard to religion, which evinces that the restoration of true religion, promised under the figures of a second coming of the Lord and establishment of a New Jerusalem, cannot be much longer delayed, without the most serious injury to the best interests of the human race. And I will conclude with showing, That there is nothing in our views of this subject which can be justly charged with enthusiasm, but that, on the contrary, they furnish the best antidote to every species of fanaticism and spiritual delusion.

I. With regard to the first of these subjects then, it is first to be observed that nothing is more true than a remark which has been made by almost every commentator that ever wrote upon the fulfilment of prophecy; namely, *That the exact meaning of the prophecies is never understood, till the time of their accomplishment.* This was strikingly experienced in regard to the prophecies which announced the coming of the Lord in the flesh. Although the whole Jewish nation knew from those prophecies that a Messiah was to appear, and the more learned among them could even point out truly where he would be born, they were so much in the dark respecting every thing else that concerned him, looking only for a carnal and not a spiritual Saviour, that, when he did come, they rejected him and put him to death. And even the disciples who received him,—even the twelve apostles whom he peculiarly selected,—so much partook of the common errors of their countrymen, that they disputed which of them should be the greatest, or have the highest post, in the temporal kingdom which they supposed he was about to set up.* Even at the moment of his ascension, they asked him whether he would not restore the temporal kingdom of Israel†; and it was not till they had received the gift of the Holy Spirit from their glorified Lord, that they had just ideas of the nature of that kingdom into which they had been admitted themselves, and which they were to preach to others.

Another remark of importance is also here necessary to be made; it is, *That even when the Apostles had received the gift of the Holy Spirit, it did not communicate to them, at once, all the truths of the Christian dispensation.* Thus they remained for a long time in the persuasion, that the gospel was to be preached only to the Jews. It was not till seven or eight years after the Lord's ascension, that Peter was convinced that it was allowable to communicate it to the Gentiles: it then required a vision and a special revelation to induce him to do it‡; and he was strictly questioned upon it afterwards by his brethren.§ It was not till ten years after this that they came to the

* Mark x. 35—45. † Acts i. 6. ‡ Ch. x. § Ch. xi. 2, 3.

conclusion, that the Gentile converts were not required to keep the law of Moses*; and they do not appear ever to have clearly seen that the Jews themselves were exempted by the gospel from the observance of that law.

If then it was only by degrees, and as occasion required, that the truths which were essential to the full knowledge of the Christian system were revealed even to the Apostles, and that they were enabled to understand the precepts and prophecies of the Old Testament as they applied to the doctrines and circumstances of Christianity, it is no wonder if it be found to be true, in the third place, *That the prophecies of the Lord himself, and of the New-Testament-prophets, relating to his second coming at a future period then very distant, and to his revival, at such second coming, of pure Christianity, after it had suffered decline and perversion, were at that time hidden from the Church.* Accordingly, it is certain that the early Christians were so much mistaken respecting the purport of these prophecies, that they all expected that the second coming of the Lord was then immediately to take place; and even the Apostles appear to have supposed that they might live to see it. They knew that the Lord's coming was to be preceded by a corruption of his religion; and because they saw corruptors of it even then appear, they concluded that the last time was then arrived. Thus the Apostle John writes, "Little children, *it is the last time*; and as ye have heard that anti-christ shall come, even now there are many anti-christs; whereby we know that *it is the last time.*"† So Peter exhorts those to whom he writes, not to be disheartened by the seeming tardiness of the arrival of the expected day, telling them, "that scoffers should come *in the last days*, saying, where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation."‡ But that even this Apostle supposed, that the expected coming, attended with a literal fulfilment of the prophecies which seem to speak of the passing away of heaven and earth, would happen during the life of persons then living, is evident from his exhorting them thus: "Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, *looking for, and hasting unto*, the coming of the day of God."§ James speaks of it as near with equal confidence: he says, "Be patient, therefore, brethren, *unto the coming of the Lord.* Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and the latter rain: be ye also patient; stablish your heart, *for the coming of the Lord* DRAWETH

* Ch. xv. † 1 John ii 18. ‡ 2 Ep. iii. 3, 4. § 2 Ep. iii. 11, 12.

NIGH.—Behold the Judge STANDETH AT THE DOOR.”* As for the Apostle Paul, he speaks on the subject to the Thessalonians, as if both himself and they, or at least some of them, would certainly live to witness it: he says, *WE which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord* shall not prevent them that sleep;” and again: “*Then WE which are alive and remain* shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air:” which so disturbed those to whom the Apostle wrote, that he found it necessary, in a second epistle, to desire them “not to be soon shaken in mind or troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as though the day of Christ were at hand” (by which he means, were immediately to take place), because there must come “a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed†,”—in which he refers to a prophecy of Daniel: nevertheless he declares, that, the mystery of iniquity *doth already work‡*” and thus still intimates that the expected coming of the Lord was by no means very distant. Accordingly, as the nature of the second coming of the Lord was not in that day openly revealed; just as the nature of his first coming had not previously been openly discovered to the Jews; the Apostles never offer any explication of it, as they do of other prophetic declarations which then had their accomplishment, but always speak of it in the same symbolic language as has been used respecting it by the Lord himself and by the ancient prophets. This language has in consequence been understood according to the literal sense only, by Christians in general, from that time to this: and thus, from age to age, mankind have lived in the expectation of beholding the Lord appear in the clouds of the firmament, and of being themselves caught up to meet him at his coming in the air.

This fact, that neither the time or the nature of the Lord’s second coming was explicitly revealed to the primitive Christian Church, nor even to the Apostles themselves, is of so great importance, that, though I think it conclusively established by what has been already advanced, yet, as strong prejudices prevail on this subject, it shall be further confirmed by unquestionable testimony.

Let me, then, remind the reflecting, that while the Lord Jesus Christ himself often speaks, in the gospels, of his second coming, he at times so expresses himself, that they who understand his words literally must suppose him to mean, that his coming to judgment was not to be protracted beyond the age in which he delivered the predictions. Thus one of the most full and explicit of his prophetic declarations is that in Matt.

* Ep. v. 7, 8, 9. † 1 Thes. iv. 15, 17. ‡ 2 Thes. ii. 2, 3. § Ver. 7.

xxiv.—“Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn; and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other. Now learn a parable of the fig tree; When his branch is yet tender and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh: so likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors. *Verily, I say unto you, this generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled*” (Vers. 29—34). Now all the Apostles, except Paul, heard this or other similar prophecies delivered, and Paul, it is certain, had a knowledge of the circumstances of the Lord’s life and discourses on earth communicated to him by revelation*: accordingly these predictions were the foundation of the knowledge possessed by the Apostles respecting the Lord’s second coming, and all that is said on that subject in their writings consists of applications of these predictions, with some of a similar kind of the Old Testament. Thus the celebrated passage in 1 Thess. iv. 15 to 17, from which an extract is given above, is simply a paraphrase of the Lord’s words just cited, which had been miraculously made known to the Apostle, whence he justly introduces it with stating, “This we say unto you *by the word of the Lord.*” Consequently, if the true meaning of the symbolic language in which the Lord delivered his predictions was not, with the predictions themselves, made known to the Apostles (and of this their writings afford no trace whatever,) they would naturally expect, as it is certain all other Christians did, who could only have taken their ideas from the teaching of the Apostles, that those prophetic announcements were to be literally fulfilled; whereas, that their literal sense is not their true sense, is evinced by the fact, that they have remained unaccomplished for seventeen hundred years beyond the period, at which, according to that sense, their accomplishment should have taken place.

Since the preceding remarks were first written, I have been much pleased at meeting the same arguments strongly urged by so judicious and highly esteemed a writer as Dr. Watts: the only difference between us in regard to this question, is that he supposes the Apostle to have known the truth of the matter, but purposely to have concealed it. So long as it is

* Gal. i. 16, 17.

acknowledged that what they have said upon the subject *is not the naked truth*, it makes little difference in the main argument, whether they withheld the naked truth through ignorance or design, and I willingly leave the reader to adopt which alternative he pleases. The passage alluded to of Dr. Watts, is in his "Essay towards the Proof of a Separate State of Souls," prefixed to his "World to Come;" and is as follows: "As the patriarchs and the Jews of old, after the Messiah was promised, were constantly expecting his first coming almost in every generation, till he did appear, and many modes of prophetic expression in Scripture, which speak of things long to come as though they were present, or just at hand, gave them some occasion for this expectation; so *the Christians of the first age did generally expect the second coming of Christ to judgment*, and the resurrection of the dead, *in that very age wherein it was foretold*. St. Paul gives us a hint of it in 2 Thess. ii. 1, 2. they supposed *the day of the Lord* was just appearing. And many expressions of Christ concerning his return or coming again after his departure, seem to represent his absence as a thing of no long continuance. It is true these words of his may partly refer to his coming to destroy Jerusalem, and the coming in of his kingdom among the gentiles; or his coming by his Messenger of death; yet they generally, in their supreme or final sense, point to his coming to raise the dead, and judge the world. And from the words of Christ, also, concerning John, 'If I will that he tarry till I come' (John xxi. 22), it is probable that *the apostles themselves at first*, as well as other Christians, *might derive this apprehension of his speedy coming*.

"It is certain (Dr. W. proceeds) that when Christ speaks of his coming in general, and promiscuous, and parabolical terms, whether with regard to the destruction of Jerusalem or the judgment of the world, he saith, 'Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled' (Matt. xxiv. 34). And the Apostles frequently told the world, the coming of the Lord was near: 'The Lord is at hand:' (Phil. iv. 5): 'Exhorting one another—so much the more, as you see *the day approaching*:' (Heb. x. 25:) and that this is the day of the coming of Christ, verse 37 assures us: 'For yet *a little while*, he that shall come will come, and *will not tarry*.' 'Now it is high time to awake out of sleep: the night is far spent; *the day is at hand*' (Rom. xiii. 12). 'To him who is *ready to judge* the quick and the dead' (1 Pet. iv. 5). '*The end of all things is at hand*' (ver. 7). 'The coming of the Lord *draweth nigh*: Behold, the judge *standeth at the door*' (James v. 8, 9). 'Seal not up the prophecy of this book, for

the time is at hand' (Rev. xxii. 10): 'And behold, *I come quickly*, and my reward is with me, to give to every man as his work shall be' (ver. 12). and the sacred volume is closed with this assurance, '*Surely I come quickly*:' and the echo and expectation of the Apostle, or the church, 'Amen! even so, come Lord Jesus.'

"It is granted (our author goes on) that in prophetical expressions, such as all these are, some obscurity is allowed: and it may be doubtful, perhaps, whether some of them may refer to Christ's coming by the destruction of Jerusalem, or his coming to call particular persons away by his messenger of death, or his appearance at the last judgment. It is granted, also, that it belongs to prophetical language to set things far distant, as it were before our eyes, and make them seem present, or very near at hand. But still these expressions had plainly such an influence on the primitive Christians, as that *they imagined the day of resurrection and judgement was very near*. — And though they [the Apostles] never asserted that Christ would come to raise the dead and judge the world in that age, yet when they knew themselves that he would not come so soon, they might not think it necessary to give every Christian, or every Church, an immediate account of the more distant time of this great event, that the uncertainty of it might keep them ever watchful; and even when St. Paul informs the Thessalonians, that *the day of the Lord was not so very near* as they imagined it, (2 Thes. ii. 2,) yet *he does not put it off beyond that century by any express language*."

Now has not Dr. Watts here fully proved, that, whether or not the Apostles themselves knew that the Lord's second coming was not to take place in that age, they often spoke of it in such terms as conveyed the immediate expectation of it to the minds of the primitive Christians? But what this popular writer says respecting the allowed obscurity of prophetical expressions, though true in itself, is not here strictly applicable. For the passages which he cites from the Epistles are none of them original prophecies; thus, properly speaking, they are not prophecies at all; this character only belongs to the single passage he has quoted from Matthew, and to those from the Revelation; the others, being only repetitions by the Apostles, in their own language, of declarations made by the Lord Jesus Christ while on earth, are not prophecies any more than the repetition by any teacher, in his own language, of a prophetic declaration, is a prophecy. Some of the original prophetical expressions are indeed retained; but when these are repeated at second hand, without explanation, every hearer supposes that he who repeats them means them to be literally

understood. As then the Apostles did thus repeat them, and it thus is certain that they meant their hearers or readers to understand them according to the literal expression, it becomes next to impossible to suppose, that they themselves understood them any otherwise : and if so, it is a certain fact, that the true meaning of the prophecies respecting the second coming of the Lord was entirely hidden from the Church founded at his first coming, even from the Apostles themselves ; just as the true meaning of the prophecies relating to his first coming has been hidden from the Jews, and even from the prophets by whom they were delivered.

To be quite certain, however, that this is not merely a probable surmise, I have examined all the passages in the writings of the Apostles in which any reference is made to a future coming of the Lord ; and I earnestly advise all the Candid and Reflecting to do the same. Some of the texts, I find, might be equally suited to the context, whether that event were meant to be represented as near or distant ; but in many of them the introduction of the subject is destitute of all force, and even of applicability, upon any other supposition, than that the writer understood the event as near ; and whilst, as has already been seen, there are many passages which expressly affirm it to be near at hand in the age of the Apostles, there is not one which speaks of it as being then distant, or which affords an inference that it was regarded as distant by the writer.*

* To give every reader an opportunity of easily ascertaining this for himself, I here add all the texts I have been able to find in which any mention of it is made by the Apostles, only omitting those decisive ones which have been cited already. (I have marked by *Italic* characters the expressions which would particularly lead the first readers to expect the great event in their own life-time).

Paul exhorts the Corinthians of that day to be "*waiting* for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall also confirm you *unto the end*, [compare Matthew xxiv. 13,] that ye may be blameless in *the day of our Lord Jesus Christ*" [1 Cor. i. 7, 8]. "For we write none other things unto you than what ye read or acknowledge : and I trust ye shall acknowledge *even to the end* ; as also ye have acknowledged us in part, that we are your rejoicing, even as ye also are ours, *in the day of the Lord Jesus*" [2 Cor. i. 13, 14]. "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed *unto the day of Redemption*" [Eph. iv. 30 : compare Luke xxi. 28]. "He which hath begun a good work in you, *will perform it* [or *carry it on*] *until the day of Jesus Christ*" [Phil. i. 6]. "And this I pray,—*that ye may be sincere and without offence till the day of Christ*" [ver. 9, 10]. "Our conversation is in heaven, from whence also *we look for the Savior, the Lord Christ*" [Ch. iii. 20]. "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory" [Col. iii. 4]. "Ye turned to God from idols, to serve the living and true God, and *to wait for his Son from heaven*" [1 Thes. i. 9 10]. "What is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing ? are not even ye,

Now let any one who had read the texts cited below, transfer himself in thought to the age in which such declarations

in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ, at his coming?" [Ch. ii. 19]. "The Lord make you to increase and abound in love, &c.—to the end he may *stablish* your hearts unblameable in holiness before God, even our Father, *at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, with all his saints*" [Ch. iii. 12, 13]. "Ye, brethren, are not in darkness, *that that day should overtake you as a thief*" [Ch. v. 4]. "I pray God *your whole spirit, and soul, and body, be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ*" [ver. 23]. "Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you, and to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels," &c. [2 Thess. i. 6, 7]. "The Lord direct your hearts into the love of God, and into *the patient waiting for Christ*" [Ch. iii. 5]. "I give thee charge—that thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukable, *until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ*" [1 Tim. vi. 14]. "I am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed to him against that day" [2 Tim. i. 12]. "The Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord in that day" [ver. 18]. "This know also, that *in the last days* perilous times shall come: for men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, &c.—*from such turn away*" [Ch. iii. 1—5; where, note, that the words being addressed to Timothy personally, imply that he should live to see those *last days*]. "I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom" [Ch. iv. 1]. "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but to all them that love his appearing" [ver. 8]. "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and unto them that look for him he shall appear the second time without sin unto salvation" [Heb. ix. 28]. "Who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation *ready to be revealed in the last time*; where in ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness, through manifold temptations, that the trial of your faith, being more precious than gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise and honour and glory *at the appearing of Jesus Christ*" [1 Peter i. 5, 6, 7]. "Wherefore—*hope to the end* for the grace that is to be brought unto you *at the revelation of Jesus Christ*" [ver. 13]. "When the chief shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away" [Ch. v. 4]. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is" [1 John iii. 2]. "For there are *certain men crept in unawares, &c.*—And Enoch the seventh from Adam prophesied *of these*, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, &c.—*These* are murmurers, complainers, *walking after their own lusts, &c.*—But, beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before by the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ; how that they told you there should be mockers *in the last time*, who should *walk after their own* ungodly *lusts*. Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy; to the only wise God our Saviour," &c. [Jude ver. 4, 14—18, 24, 25].

were written, and then judge whether he would not have concluded, from the passages collected, in conjunction with those cited by Dr. Watts and in our previous observations, that they who thus spoke continually of *the day of the appearing of the Lord Jesus Christ*, who declared that it was to take place in *the last days or times*, and who affirmed that the last days or times *were then begun*, meant to affirm, that the appearing of the Lord was in that age to take place, and to be witnessed by some then living. The event has proved that the expectation was erroneous; yet not one expression occurs which could tend to correct the mistake. Accordingly, it is universally allowed that such was the opinion entertained on the subject by the first Christians; and it is equally certain, that the first Christians could have no opinion on the subject but what they derived from the first teachers of Christianity, the Apostles.

Yet most of the Commentators, unwilling to admit that any mystery whatever was kept hidden from the Apostles, have supposed with Dr. Watts, that notwithstanding they always spoke as if the second coming of the Lord was to be expected in that age, they well knew to the contrary. Thus, for example, the pious Doddridge, in his note on the words of Paul (1 Thes. iv. 15), "*We which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord*,"—notwithstanding he translates the original, still more strongly, "*we who remain alive at the coming of the Lord*"—appears much displeased with those who conclude, from the plain sense of the words, that the apostle himself expected to be one of those who should then "*remain alive*." He begins his note with this statement; "This hath been interpreted by many, as an intimation, that the *apostle* expected to be found *alive at the day of judgment*: and, on that interpretation, some have urged it as an instance of his entertaining, at least for awhile, *mistaken* notions on that head, as if the day of the Lord were nearly approaching:" to this Dr. D. objects, that "this is contrary to his own explication of the matter, 2 Thes. ii. 1, &c."—though, as Dr. Watts remarks, when the Apostle there "informs the Thessalonians that the day of the Lord was not *so very near as they imagined it*, he does not put it off *beyond that century* by any express language." Dr. Doddridge has only to object further, that it is contrary to other passages in which he expresses his own expectation of death;" but this only proves, that when he says "*we who remain alive*," he does not mean to affirm positively that he should be one who should thus remain, but only that he thought it not impossible. Had he meant to affirm that the coming of the Lord would take place in that age, but certainly not till after his own death, he would not have said, "*we who remain alive*," but "*you who*

remain alive ;” but had he meant to exclude all that generation from the possibility of witnessing the event, he would neither have said “WE,” nor “YOU, who *remain alive*, but “THEY who *shall be alive*.” It seems the more extraordinary that the worthy Expositor should here attempt to clear the Apostle from the imputation of imperfect knowledge, and by such weak arguments, when he had just before admitted a lower degree of the charge to be probably true ; for in his note on verse 13, after quoting the remark of Saurin, that the Apostle did not then exactly know whether Christ’s appearance would be in that age, or at some much more remote distance of time,” he very judiciously observes, “And this ignorance was certainly consistent with the knowledge of all that was necessary to the preaching of the Gospel ;” referring to Mark xiii. 32.

But surely, the supposition that the Apostles *knew* that the Lord’s coming would *not* take place in that age, and yet spoke so as naturally to beget *that* belief in their readers, lays them open to much worse imputations than follow from that of mere ignorance or mistake. Thus, as Doddridge himself notices, the Jew Orobio affirms, that Paul expressed himself as he did to the Thessalonians through artifice, to serve a present purpose, holding out the expectation of being taken up alive into heaven in a very little time, as a bait to invite people to Christianity. So the author of a deistical publication, insidiously denominated “*Not Paul but Jesus*,”* draws one of his reasons for regarding that Apostle as a self-interested impostor, from this occurrence, which he describes as a bait of another order. According to the representation of this subtle writer, Paul wished to produce a persuasion that the end of all things was at hand, to render people indifferent to their worldly property, in order that they might be more ready to give him a good share of it ; but the measures he took for this purpose with the Thessalonians operated so much more strongly than he intended, that many were thrown into such a panic as to neglect all business entirely, (which, the objector urges, is stated in 2 Thes. iii. 11) ; wherefore he found it necessary, in a second Epistle, (ch. ii. 1, &c.) to put the expected end of all things a little further off, and to endeavor to allay, in some measure, the terrors he had raised.

Is there then any view of this affair which will clear the Apostles from the imputation either of disgraceful ignorance or of wilful misrepresentation, and thus will at once take away the ground of the cavils of Jewish and infidel objectors, and obviate the necessity for such weak excuses as are usually re-

* This work was published under the name of “Gamaliel Smith,” but the real name of the author was the celebrated Jeremy Bentham.

sorted to by Christian defenders? Do we not obtain such a view, when we see that, while every thing relating to the doctrines of the primitive Christian Church, and to the interpretation of the prophecies of the Old Testament relating to the Lord's first advent, was clearly revealed to the Apostles, after having been kept hidden till the time of their accomplishment had come, the prophecies of the New Testament relating to his second advent were in like manner kept hidden till the time for their fulfilment should arrive? Does not this evince, that ignorance upon this single subject,—the time and manner of the fulfilment of the prophecies of the New Testament,—no more forms a flaw in the character of the Apostles, than ignorance respecting the time and manner of the Lord's first coming constitutes a blemish in the character of the Jewish patriarchs and worthies? The two advents of the Lord belong to two different dispensations: according to the order always observed in the Divine Economy, the things peculiar to a later dispensation are never openly revealed under a former: consequently, *It would have been inconsistent with the order always observed in the Divine Economy, had the Apostles, whose province it was to proclaim the Lord's first advent, with the discoveries proper to it, been equally well informed respecting the circumstances of his second.*

But satisfactorily, as it appears to me, as this view of the subject reconciles the Apostles' imperfect knowledge on this one point,—on what was beyond their commission,—with their full knowledge on others,—on all that was within it; and fully as it relieves them from the imputation either of disgraceful ignorance or wilful misrepresentation; I do not expect that it will meet the approbation of those advocates for common opinions, not belonging to the class of the Candid and Reflecting, who had rather deliver the sacred writers, gagged and bound, into the hands of their enemies, to be dealt with as they see fit, than vindicate them by an explanation which detects deficiencies in the system of their interpreters. But should any such undertake the refutation of what has here been advanced, let them recollect, that to succeed in that attempt two things are necessary: first, they must show that some of the passages quoted above, and in the note, from the writings of the Apostles, do explicitly state, that the second coming of the Lord was not to be expected in that age, nor for seventeen centuries after it: and secondly, that none of the above cited texts do affirm that it was then at hand. Unless these points be proved,—that is, unless the Apostles' language can be made to affirm the contrary of what it does affirm,—all that may be alleged against the view here offered will be entirely beside the ques-

tion ; and it will be difficult to deny, that *the time and manner of the Lord's second coming, and the meaning of the prophetic language in which that event is predicted in the Gospels and the Apocalypse, were not revealed to the Apostles, because that time had not then arrived.*

But surely, whoever should reflect a little upon the subject, might easily see, that the manner in which the Lord's second coming is always described in Scripture, such as his appearing in the clouds, attended by angels blowing trumpets, &c., is purely figurative and symbolic ; that it is couched in the purely prophetic style of writing ; and all expositors admit that there is a distinct prophetic style used in the Scriptures, in which the ideas intended are representatively shadowed out by the images used for expressing them. Only look at the subject with some degree of elevation of mind, and you will see, that for the Lord Jesus Christ to appear in the clouds which float about the earth, at a height never exceeding a very few miles from its surface, in a form visible to the natural eyes of the inhabitants of the earth, is really an absolute impossibility. At his first advent, indeed, the Lord was beheld by men in the natural world, and even dwelt for a considerable time among them : but the reason was, because he was then in a natural body, not yet glorified, assumed from the mother, Mary : but, as I propose to show in a future Section of this Appeal, during his abode on earth, and at his resurrection, he made his human nature completely divine, and it was in a glorified or deified form, no longer partaking of the gross properties of matter, that he ascended to heaven ; Hence he never was visible to any after he rose again, except when he expressly manifested himself to them, which was done by opening the sight of their spirits. Had he still been visible to the natural eye, how came it to pass that he never was seen by the Jews after his resurrection ? Had he still been in a body that was obvious to the natural senses, how did he appear suddenly in the midst of his disciples, when they were assembled secretly for fear of the Jews, and the door was fastened to secure them from interruption ? Our natural sight will not penetrate through walls and doors ; how then, to such sight, can that divine form be visible, which walls and doors could not exclude ? Thus the Lord's glorified person can now only be made visible to man by opening the sight of his spirit, as was done in all the cases of spiritual appearance recorded in the Scriptures ? and the Lord can only thus be manifested to those who are in the acknowledgment of him ; for this reason he never made himself visible, after his resurrection, to the gainsaying Jews ; and for the same reason he never will make himself visible to the inhabitants of the world at large :

consequently, it is not in a natural sense that he will appear in the clouds of the sky, showing himself to all the dwellers upon the earth.

But that the Lord is not literally to make his second advent in this manner, is evident from another consideration, the force of which every one may appreciate, whether he sees the strength of the last argument or not: and that other circumstance is, that in other passages of Scripture his coming is described in a different fashion. In the nineteenth chapter of the Revelation, he is represented as coming riding on a white horse, with all the armies of heaven following him upon white horses. Now, who ever understood that this description was to be taken literally? No person ever conceived that He would come to judgment riding on horseback, followed by innumerable troops of angels, all likewise mounted on horseback: yet there is no more reason for rejecting the expectation of his coming in this manner, and regarding the language as entirely figurative, than there is for adopting that of his coming in the clouds, and regarding this as a literal representation of the fact. The truth is, that both are entirely figurative, and of nearly the same signification; since his coming on a white horse denotes his restoring the right understanding of the Word, and illuminating thereby the intellectual faculties of man; and his coming in the clouds with power and great glory denotes the unfolding of the literal sense of the Word, and his presence in the bright glory of its spiritual and genuine signification. I have endeavored to prove this at length in another publication, in which it is attempted to be shown, that the Lord is called the Son of man, in Scripture, in reference to his character as the Word or Divine Truth*; and it is always by his title of Son of man that the Lord himself speaks of his second coming: so, the passage just referred to in the Revelation expressly states, that he who is to come riding on the white horse, is the Word of God. Evidently, then, the promised coming of the Lord as the Son of man and the Word of God must denote a new discovery of the divine truth of his Word,—a restoration of the genuine doctrines of the church,—a revival of a just knowledge of the Lord and of his worship, and an opening of the sacred contents of His Holy Word.

But that this is, in general, what is meant by the second coming of the Lord,—by the appearing of the Son of man in the clouds with power and great glory, and by his riding in heaven, as the Word of God, on a white horse,—is further evident from the fact, that it is to be accompanied or followed by the descent from heaven of a New Jerusalem. We read in

* *Plenary Inspiration*, &c, p. 333, &c.

Rev. xxi. "I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away, and there was no more sea. And I John saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them and be their God."* Now what can this, with any degree of consistency, be understood to signify, but a renewal of the true church of God among mankind? Many, I know, apply it to the state of the saints in heaven: but in this they do the most palpable violence to the words: for how can that be pretended to be *in* heaven which is expressly said to come down *out* of heaven? how can that describe the state of saints in *heaven*, which is expressly said to be the tabernacle, or abiding place, of God, *with men*? Accordingly the best interpreters apply it to a new state of the church on earth. Thus Dr. Hammond, a celebrated writer of the Church of England, comments upon it thus: "That it signifies not the state of glorified saints in heaven, appears by its descending from heaven in both places [where it is mentioned]; and that, according to the use of the phrase, ch. x. 1, and xviii. 1, is an expression of some eminent benefit to the church; and being here set down with the glory of God upon it, it will signify the pure Christian Church, joining Christian practice with the profession thereof, and that in a flourishing condition, expressed by the new heaven and new earth. In this sense," he adds, "we have the supernal Jerusalem, (Gal. iv. 26) and the New Jerusalem (Rev. iii. 12), where, to the constant professor is promised, that God will write on him the name of God, and the name of the city of God, the New Jerusalem; which there is the pure Catholic Christian Church." As to its being first said, that John saw a new heaven and a new earth, because the former heaven and earth had passed away, all commentators admit, that that is a phrase constantly used in the prophetic style to denote a complete renovation of the thing treated of,—the putting of an entire end to one order of things, and the commencement of a new one, either with respect to particular or to general churches; in which sense it occurs in numerous passages of the Old Testament, where a new heaven and earth cannot literally be meant.

The common reader of the Scriptures naturally supposes, when he comes to a prophecy respecting the passing away of heaven and earth, that the phrase refers to the end of the world: though the most simple reader must be somewhat

* Ver. 1, 2, 3.

puzzled to understand how the new heaven and new earth, spoken of as to succeed the former, can relate to the state of saints in heaven, which is the only state that our natural apprehensions lead us to look for after the end of the world. The learned, however, have long been so fully convinced, that these phrases do not in general relate to the end of the world, and to the state of the saints expected to succeed that event, that it is wonderful how they can still retain the opinion, that the end of the world is, nevertheless, predicted by any of them. To show how the learned in general understand these prophetic phrases, I will here subjoin a few quotations.

Sir Isaac Newton, whose scheme of symbolical language has been adopted, with some variations, by all succeeding commentators, states his general principle, and his application of it to the phrase, "heaven and earth," thus: "The figurative language of the prophets is taken from the analogy between the world natural, and an empire or kingdom considered as a world politic. Accordingly, the whole world natural, consisting of heaven and earth, signifies the whole world politic, consisting of thrones and people.—The creating of a new heaven and earth, and the passing of an old one, or the beginning and end of a world, are put for the rise and ruin of a body politic." A little extending this idea, the Rev. Mr. Faber, in his "Dissertation on the Prophecies," states his view of these symbols thus; "*The symbolical heaven, when interpreted temporally, signifies the whole body politic. On the other hand, the symbolical heaven when interpreted spiritually, signifies the whole body of the church militant. The earth, when taken in a temporal sense, imports, in the abstract, the territorial dominions of any Pagan or irreligious empire.—In a spiritual sense, the earth denotes a state of paganism or apostacy.*" So Dr. Doddridge, in his paraphrase of the Lord's words, "The sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken," says, "That is, according to the sublimity of prophetic language, *the whole civil and ecclesiastical constitution of the nation* shall not only be shocked, but totally dissolved." To the same purport, Beausobre and L'Enfant, in their notes on the words, "the sun shall be darkened," observe, "The prophet Isaiah uses the same expression when foretelling the destruction of Jerusalem: *it is a prophetic style which must not be literally understood.* Jesus Christ gives in these words a description of *the total overthrow of the Jewish state*, that was closely to follow the destruction of Jerusalem."—Whether the expositions given in these examples have any truth in them or not, they are sufficient to evince that the learn-

ed have found it necessary to relinquish the literal interpretation of those passages of Scripture which speak of the passing away of heaven and earth, or of such convulsions in the heavenly bodies, as, if actual, would involve the destruction of the world. I will subjoin a few passages of Scripture, which must convince every one that such phrases are not to be literally understood.

We read in Isaiah, ch. xxxiv: "All the host of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll; and all their host shall fall down, as the leaf falleth off the vine, and as the falling fig from the fig-tree." This is stated as a consequence of a judgment to be performed in the land of Idumea, or Edom; for it is added, "For my sword shall be bathed in heaven; behold, it shall come down upon Idumea, and upon the people of my curse, to judgment." And the reason is given for it a little further on: "For it is the Lord's day of vengeance, and the year of recompenses, *for the controversy of Zion*;"—that is, because the Lord will plead the cause of his Church, signified by Zion, against those who would destroy her, signified by Idumea. But whatever judgments may at any time have visited the land of Idumea, they certainly were not accompanied by a dissolution of the heavens. Similar statements are made in Ezekiel xxxii. on occasion of predicting the conquest of Egypt; and in Isa. xiii. in connexion with the announced destruction of Babylon; yet though it is certain that Babylon was captured by Cyrus, and Egypt subdued by Cambyzes, we do not find that the heavenly bodies quaked in sympathy with those events, and fell into convulsions or dissolution. The prophet Joel also announces similar disorders in the heavens as to happen at the time of the Lord's advent in the flesh, almost in the same terms as are used by the Lord himself in reference to his second coming:—"I will shew wonders in the heavens above, and signs in the earth beneath, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke; the sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before that great and notable day of the Lord come;" which prophecy is quoted by Peter (Acts ii. 16) as being then fulfilled. As then no destruction of heaven and earth, and no such convulsions as would include their destruction, took place at that time, so, we may conclude, neither will such things happen when the Lord's predictions respecting his second coming are fulfilled, or when that great change takes place which the Revelator foretells under the figure of the removal of heaven and earth. In like manner, the establishing of new heavens and a new earth is announced in prophecies which have received their fulfillment. Thus the whole 65th chapter of Isaiah

treats of the calling of the Gentiles and rejection of the Jews at the Lord's coming into the world, and establishing the Christian church : which last event is figuratively predicted by the Lord's saying, "Behold, I create *new heavens and a new earth* ; and the former shall not be remembered nor come into mind : " that the church under a new dispensation, or in a new and improved state, is what is here treated of, is evident from its being immediately added, "Behold, I create *Jerusalem* a rejoicing, and her people a joy ; " and all that follows shows, that it is not a state in the other world that is spoken of, but in this. That this is the purport of the phrase, is further evident from a passage in the 51st chapter : where speaking of the restoration of the church, the Lord says, "I have put my words into thy mouth, and I have covered thee in the shadow of my hand, that I may *plant the heavens and lay the foundations of the earth*, and say unto *Zion*, Thou art my people."

Thus then we also find, that, in the Old Testament as well as in the Revelation, the formation of new heavens and earth is mentioned in connexion with the restoration and re-establishment of Zion or Jerusalem : the reason is, because Zion and Jerusalem are constantly mentioned in prophecy as types of the church itself. In the Old Testament, when their restoration is spoken of, they are evident types of the church which was to be raised in consequence of the Lord's coming into the world, and called the Christian church, to distinguish it from the Israelitish or Jewish ; consequently, in the Revelation, a New Jerusalem can mean nothing else than a New Church,—a restoration of pure Christianity to more than its primitive glory. And both these events are said to be accompanied with the formation of a new heaven and new earth, to denote the entire newness of the respective churches as to their inward life and outward conversation, internal principles and external practice ; all the corrupt persuasions and evils which had perverted the former churches being wholly removed.

Surely then it must be allowed to be evident that the circumstance of the manifestation of the New Jerusalem being fixed by the prophet after the passing away of the former heaven and earth and the formation of a new heaven and earth in their place, so far from sanctioning the opinion that it is a figure used to describe the state of the saints in heaven, only proves, more conclusively, that it is intended to denote an entirely new state of the church on earth ; for it is palpably evident, that in every other instance throughout the Scriptures in which the passing away of heaven and earth, or convulsions in the heavenly bodies equivalent to their dissolution, are mentioned, such catastrophes in outward nature are not meant, but

that they are prophetic phrases solely intended to express an entire change and renewal in the thing which is the subject of the prophecy.

II. Here then, I trust you will admit, we have a clear and, at least, highly probable view of the signification of the prophecies which announce a Second Coming of the Lord, and the manifestation of a New Jerusalem: the next consideration is, Are there any circumstances and signs observable at the present day, which lead to the conclusion, that the time for the great divine interference thus prophetically delineated has arrived? Permit me, before I proceed to offer an answer to this question, to observe, that an affirmative reply does not, as too many are inconsiderately apt to suppose, necessarily involve an absurdity. All who acknowledge the authority of the Scriptures, must allow that the Second Coming of the Lord most assuredly will take place at some period or other: and if, as I trust has been conclusively shown, the commonly imagined mode of his appearance cannot be the true one, it is the more probable that it will take place, as is also plainly predicted, in an unexpected time and manner; — “in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of man cometh.”* It is to be expected, then, that come when it may, multitudes, perhaps the majority — of the Christian world, will be unwilling to credit the tidings, and will deride those who believe them as silly enthusiasts: — as the Lord declares again, “When the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith in the earth?”† When therefore we announce to the world our belief, that this consummation of divine prophecy is now taking place, we are aware that we shall draw upon ourselves the contempt and ridicule of the superficial and the frivolous: but we are at the same time, sure that all the sober and the reflecting, — all who will candidly examine the reasons which have brought us to this conviction, must become sensible of their strength, and will find it no easy matter to put them aside. Certain it is, that all divine prediction must one day be fulfilled: if then what is advanced in proof of such fulfillment having taken place be not altogether unworthy of the subject, they who urge it are at least entitled to be listened to with candor, and to have their arguments fairly considered. If, on the contrary, the mere asserting that the time has arrived for the accomplishment of a great Scripture-prophecy, is sufficient to authorise the treatment of those who advance it with derision and contempt, then it was right in the Scribes and Pharisees to treat with contempt the testimony of the Baptist; and it will be difficult to prove them wrong when they crucified the Saviour himself.

* Mat. xxiv. 44.

† Luke xvii. 8.

If then the view of the nature of the promised Second Advent of the Lord and descent of the New Jerusalem which has now been imperfectly sketched, should be deemed probable and satisfactory, I might urge, that the publication, in the present day, of a system of Christian doctrine in which such a view is afforded, alone gives reason to apprehend, upon the principle that the prophecies of Scripture are never exactly understood till the time of their accomplishment, that the time for the accomplishment of these great prophecies has arrived, or at least, must be near at hand. It is indeed true, as has been shown, that many have before concluded, from the known signification of Jerusalem, in prophetic language, as denoting the church (a signification explicitly assigned it by the apostles*), that the New Jerusalem of the Apocalypse must signify a new and greatly improved state of Christianity in the world: our explication then of *this* sublime prophecy is not new, except in regard to the greater precision with which the particulars of its signification are unfolded: but the explication of the prophecy of the coming of the Lord in the clouds of heaven, as denoting his presence in the literal sense of his Word and the unfolding of the bright glory of its spiritual or internal sense, was never known in the church, till delivered in the doctrines which we believe to be those of the "New Jerusalem;" if then this is the true explication (and that it is so is capable of being proved with a weight of evidence that makes negation difficult†), this circumstance alone affords a sign, that the time for the accomplishment of these predictions, in their true sense, which is their spiritual sense, has arrived. The mere statement of this argument here may not appear to carry much weight: but when it is connected with the knowledge of what the doctrines which we believe to be those of the "New Jerusalem" are; when these doctrines are seen to exhibit all the great truths of pure Christianity in a clearer light than ever they were placed before, and to discover with demonstrative evidence the errors of the sentiments by which their genuine lustre has been long obscured; when, together with the doctrines of pure Christianity, the spiritual sense of the Scriptures is seen to be truly unfolded, its existence demonstrated, and the Word of God proved in consequence to be the Word of God indeed:—when, I say, these truths are seen, as they may be seen, in the writings of the Author we so highly esteem; every mind which duly appreciates them will be apt to conclude, that such dis-

* Gal. iv. 26; Heb. xii. 22.

† See some of this evidence in "The Plenary Inspiration," &c., in the passage referred to in a former note, and in the Appendix to that work, No. iv.

coveries could never have been made by any unassisted human intellect, and that the only probable way of assigning them an origin, is, to regard them as a consequence of that Second Coming of the Lord which they announce. I do not however insist upon this argument at present ; but I trust that some of the considerations which give it weight, will appear in the progress of this Appeal.

But beside such evidences that the present is the era of the Second Coming of the Lord as require examination to discern them, are there none which may be obvious even to the superficial observer ? It is said, that “ every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him ;” * words which imply, that his coming must be attended with signs perceptible to every understanding, even to those who do not, and will not acknowledge him, how palpably soever the signs may declare his advent : Are there then any such signs as these exhibited before the world at this day ? I answer without hesitation, Such signs are abundant and obvious ; so much so, that there is not one person in this country possessing a share of information and observation sufficient to raise him above the most stupid of the vulgar, who has not remarked them with astonishment, — who does not behold them making continually fresh calls upon his attention. It is true, that, though the signs are obvious, the true cause from which they proceed is not generally adverted to. Because the manner of the Lord’s second coming, like that of his first coming, differs from the common expectation, his presence is not generally discerned now, any more than it was then : But this only strengthens the parallelism of the case ; since the Lord rebuked that generation also, because they could not “ discern the signs of the times.” † But whether discerned, — rightly weighed and discriminated, — or not, the signs have been such as to force themselves on the notice of all. Does not every voice confess that we are living in a most extraordinary era of the world ? Is not every mind impressed with the conviction that there is something almost preternatural in the character of the present times ? Has not the change which has taken place during the last forty or fifty years, the seeds of which had been fermenting for twenty or thirty years previously, in the whole aspect of Europe, of Christendom, of the world, been such as has filled with amazement every one who has witnessed it, every one who contemplates it ? — After every section of the great family of mankind has been seen struggling through convulsions which seemed to threaten the dissolution of all human society, does not order, — a new and improved order, — appear again to be emerging out

* Rev. i. 7.

† Mat. xvi. 3 ; Luke xii. 56.

of chaos? Are not extraordinary improvements, in every thing connected with the comforts of human life, and the advancement of the species in civilization, in knowledge, and, ultimately, in virtue, continually springing up; and are they not continually calling forth, from every quarter, exclamations of surprise, and expanding every bosom with the hope, that the opening of a new and happier day than the world has ever before seen is now dawning on mankind? But I forbear to enter more particularly into this delightful part of my argument at present, as it will be necessary to turn to it again when I come, in the next Section but one, to treat of the Last Judgment,—a subject intimately connected with that of the Second Coming of the Lord. Meanwhile, this slight hint may suffice, perhaps, to open new ideas in the minds of the Reflecting, when they turn their attention to these striking facts. At present I will only say, that in the wonderful visitations of Providence, both in the way of judgment and of mercy, which the present generation has witnessed and is witnessing still, we behold plain signs of the times of the Second Advent. They are such, unquestionably, as are commensurate with the grandest cause which can be assigned for their production: and how can they so worthily be considered, as by beholding in them the results of the fulfillment of the last great predictions of Holy Writ,—as by viewing them as harbingers of the Second Coming of the Lord?

*Ultima Cumæi venit jam carminis ætas:
Magnus ab integro sæculorum nascitur ordo:
Jam redit et Virgo' redeunt Saturnia regna.*

III. But, in the third place, while there are many circumstances and signs in the political and social aspect of the world at this day, which indicate that the time for the divine interference described in Scripture as the Second Coming of the Lord has arrived; are there not also circumstances in the situation of the world in regard to religion, which evince that the restoration of true religion, promised under the figures of a Second Coming of the Lord and establishment of a New Jerusalem, cannot be much longer delayed without the most serious injury to the human race? It may at first perhaps appear paradoxical, that I should, on the one hand, advert to signs of the times which promise to the human race a new career of improvement and happiness, and draw thence an argument for the present being the era of the long expected Second Coming of the Lord; and, on the other hand, that I should point to signs which threaten to the human race most serious injury, to deduce thence also an argument in proof of the same position. But when the matter is accurately inspected, it will be found

that there is, in this, no inconsistency, and that the two arguments, instead of neutralizing, do in reality strongly support each other. For all the pleasing circumstances that have been alluded to only refer to man as a rational being and an inhabitant of this world; his state in regard to religion refers to him as a spiritual being also, and the destined inhabitant of eternity: an improvement of his condition in the former respect evinces an increased action of the divine influences in his behalf, the ultimate aim of which is, to effect an improvement of his condition in the latter; but could the designs of Providence in this latter respect be frustrated, no improvement of the lower kind could bring real blessings, or could possibly be permanent. When a piece of new land is to be brought into cultivation, the first thing to be done is to clear the surface of its useless products, and to prepare the soil: the next is, to sow the seeds from which is to be produced the desired harvest. All improvements in the general condition of the human race, and in the natural powers and attainments of the human mind, answer to the process of the preparation of the soil; but when it is thus prepared, unless the seeds of genuine Divine Truth be sown in it, the rankest weeds will spring up in abundance, and all the pains of the preparation be made abortive.

Here then let us ask a few questions. Do the views of religion generally entertained afford these seeds? Are the seeds which they do afford such as the soil of the human mind, in its present improved state of preparation, finds congenial to itself, and which it will willingly admit into its bosom? If not, is there not a manifest necessity, if man continues to be an object of regard to his Maker, that a new dispensation of Divine Truth, adapted to the present state and wants of the human mind, should be communicated from its Divine Source;—a dispensation by which the veil of error, in which the doctrines of genuine Christianity have been too long involved, should be torn away, and the face of pure Religion, in all the glory of her native beauty, should be again discovered to mankind; And should such a dispensation be too long withheld;—in other words, should the Second Coming of the Lord be too long delayed; is there not reason to apprehend that the rank weeds of Infidelity, which have already, in copious abundance, begun to appear, would overspread the whole field of the human mind, and blast all hopes of any real improvement, in wisdom and happiness, for the human race?

To consider each of these questions with the attention which its importance demands, would require more space than can consistently be allowed to this portion of our Appeal; I shall therefore answer them very briefly, and leave you, to whose

reflections my Appeal is addressed, more maturely to weigh them for yourselves.

The first of them,—*Do the views of religion now generally entertained afford the pure seeds of Divine Truth?*—will perhaps receive a conclusive answer in some of the future Sections of this Appeal: for if it shall then appear that the Doctrines of Genuine Truth on the most momentous subject of faith and life are different from those commonly maintained, it is evident, that pure divine truth is not in these to be found: and I had rather this should thus appear by inference, than enter into a harsh exposure of what we esteem the errors of the prevailing views on religion.

The second question,—*Are the seeds which the prevailing views of religion do afford, such as the soil of the human mind, in its present improved state of preparation, finds congenial to itself, and which it will willingly admit into its bosom?*—may perhaps be answered without offence to any one; for it is a simple question of fact, and the fact, as obvious to every one, decidedly answers it in the negative. Is it not a fact which every one has observed, that the great bulk of mankind, at the present day, hold their religious sentiments much more loosely than was formerly the case? They, even, who are most decidedly convinced of the truth of the Christian religion in general, are for the most part, much less tenacious than their fathers used to be of the truth of any particular scheme of it: indeed, were I to say, that few feel any considerable confidence in the truth of the doctrines held by their respective sects as the very doctrines of Christianity, I believe I should only state the sum of all individual experience on the subject. Among the evident signs of a great change which has taken place in the human mind, or in men's modes of thinking, this is one; that men are universally become more disposed than formerly to inquire into the truth of the doctrines which they are required to believe, and are becoming daily less and less capable of acquiescing in implicit faith without the exercise of their own reason and understanding: how then is it possible that doctrines, the chief of which have always been acknowledged by their advocates to be incomprehensible,—to be matters of such a faith as rejects all interference of the understanding, because, if the understanding were allowed its exercise, it would reject them;—how is it possible that such doctrines can retain their influence over the human mind in its present altered state? Most unquestionably true is the remark of the late celebrated Christian orator, a remark made by him long before he diverged into his peculiarities,—that the forms under which religion is usually presented, though sufficient to feed with spiritual suste-

nance the minds of men in past ages, are no longer suited to the necessities of the present, but are become as "lifeless and bare trunks containing in them neither sap nor nourishment."* Unsatisfying dogmas, if they led the well-disposed mind to the acknowledgment of his God and Saviour and to the life of religion, might answer the main ends of true religion, so long as the human mind could simply acquiesce in them without inquiry: but when the human mind has come into such a state as to be satisfied with a blind faith no longer;—when it also is prepared, by the improved culture of its rational powers, for the reception of the seeds of the pure and genuine truth;—it no longer finds such unsatisfying dogmas congenial to itself;—it no longer can draw from them its needed stores of spiritual nourishment; and it refuses therefore to admit their seeds into its bosom. That this is, most extensively, the state of the human mind at this day in regard to the views of religion commonly prevailing, is too evident for the most determined advocate of those views to deny.

Then, assuredly, our next question must be answered at once in the affirmative; and it must be admitted, *That there is a manifest necessity, if man continues to be an object of regard to his Maker, that a new dispensation of Divine Truth, adapted to the present state and wants of the human mind, should be communicated from its Divine Source:—*in other words, that the long expected Second Coming of the Lord should in these times be revealed. This dispensation must be such, as to remove the clouds of error in which the beauty of pure Christianity has been long involved; to restore the right understanding of the word of God, and conclusively to demonstrate its divine origin; to exhibit, in a rational as well as Scriptural light, the divinity of the Christian Redeemer, without the just acknowledgment of which no Church truly called Christian can exist; and to display in a satisfactory manner the nature of man's immortality and of his life hereafter, at the same time that it re-discovers the true nature of the means by which that immortality may be made an immortality of happiness. In short, it must be a dispensation which shall effect the union of reason with religion, without divesting the latter of its spirituality, as merely rational (as they are called) schemes of religion invariably have done; but which shall add spirituality to reason, and exalt it with both. Whether the system of religion embraced by those who humbly trust that they belong to the New Church of the Lord, which they believe to be predicted in the Revelation under the figure of a New Jerusalem, an-

* Rev. E. Irving in his Farewell Sermon at Glasgow on his first coming to London.

swers to this character, may in some measure appear as we proceed: but, without reference to any specific system, it seems difficult to deny, that the communication of such a dispensation of Divine Truth as we have here slightly sketched an idea of, is essentially important to the present state and spiritual necessities of mankind.

For should such a dispensation be too long withheld, must we not answer our last question also in the affirmative, and conclude, *That there is reason to apprehend that the rank weeds of Infidelity, which have already, in copious abundance, begun to appear, would overspread the whole field of the human mind, and blast all hopes of any real improvement, in wisdom and happiness, for the human race?* The strong hold of Infidelity is, the irrationality of the doctrines commonly affirmed to be those of the Word of God. These are such as reason, when once it ventures to look at them, must reject: and when such doctrines are supposed to be those of the Scriptures, and the true nature of the Scriptures themselves is also totally misunderstood, the inevitable consequence is, that the Scriptures are rejected with them. Set then the Scriptures in their proper light; especially, prove that they are written by the laws of that invariable correspondence or analogy which exists by creation between natural things and spiritual, whence, while merely natural things are for the most part treated of in their literal sense, they are only used as types of purely spiritual ideas;—thus, prove that the Scriptures have in them a spiritual sense in which the wisdom of God in all its glory shines: then show what their doctrines really are, and evince that the genuine dictates of Scripture invariably harmonize with the genuine dictates of Reason,—that though they contain truths far beyond the reach of unassisted Reason to discover, they always are such as Reason, thus enlightened, accepts, approves, and can by numerous arguments confirm: thus, exhibit the main topics of religion in their proper light, and you immediately deprive Infidelity of its power over the unsophisticated mind, that retains its unbiassed love of truth, and desire of knowing it. But certainly, nothing like this is done in the views of religion commonly prevailing; and we see the awful consequences; we see, not only deism, but atheism, unblushingly avowed by numbers even in this favored land; while on the continent of Europe it is too well known that they are far more universal, both among the Roman Catholic and the Protestant States. The fashionable school of divinity, even, through a great part of Christendom, led by the late Drs. Semler and Eichhorn, allows nothing of the proper nature of inspiration to the New Testament, and denies it to the Old Testament altogether, in-

somuch that the Consistory of Wurtemberg have gone to the length of forbidding the clergy to take from the Old Testament the subjects of their sermons.* Here are plain symptoms indeed of a growing tendency to infidelity: Is there any thing in the views of the Scriptures, and the doctrines of Christianity, commonly entertained, which is capable of stemming the torrent? Is there not then reason to apprehend the most disastrous consequences to the human race, should the proper antidote be much longer withheld, — should the Second Coming of the Lord, in the sense explained above, be much longer delayed?

IV. To come to the conclusion of the present subject.

What has been offered, may, I would fain hope, have been sufficient to satisfy all who consider the important subject with due reflection, that our pretensions are not very extravagant when we affirm our belief, that a new dispensation of Divine Truth is in reality in this day communicated, and that we are actually living in the age of the Second Coming of the Lord. But some of you, perhaps, may be afraid to give ear to the arguments presented by the signs we have considered, and to admit the belief, that the light by which they are discovered, and the doctrines with which they are connected, are really those of the New Jerusalem, for fear of incurring the reproach of enthusiasm. Enthusiasm is the charge with which the world is ever ready to stigmatise all who sincerely believe that God exercises a providence in human affairs, especially in whatever relates to his Church, and who practically admit the acknowledgment, that the predictions of Scripture are not to remain a dead letter forever, but that it really is possible, that what Divine Truth has foretold, may one day come to pass. Indeed, none can consistently ridicule others for believing that a prediction of Scripture has come to pass, but they who in their hearts do not believe in the Scriptures at all, nor even in the Omniscience and foreknowledge of the Deity. It is true that there have been wild enthusiasts enow, who have grounded their idle fancies on the prophecies of Scripture. But how have such enthusiasts usually acted? By expecting some great thing to take place in outward nature, and themselves to be exalted to high honor and worldly dignity; — by fancying that Jesus Christ would come in person to reign on the earth, and that they that have faith to believe this would be made his vicegerents in the government of mankind: — with other extravagances of a similar kind, originating in a misconception of the true nature of divine prediction, and of the manner in

* See the Intellectual Repository for the New Church, Second Series, Vol. 1. p. 608.

SECOND COMING OF THE LORD.

which it is to be fulfilled. Look at the pretensions of the false Christs and false prophets that have arisen in different ages; and you will find notions of this kind to pervade them all. All such flights of enthusiasm find a complete antidote in the doctrine, which we are satisfied is as true now as at the Lord's first coming in the flesh, that his kingdom is not of this world. If we were told to hold out, as enthusiasts have done, peculiar privileges on this side of the grave, we perhaps, might, like some of them, soon find many more disciples; but they would be such as would not be worth having, because such as, like unconverted Peter, savor not the things of God, but the things that be of men.* We have no worldly dignities to offer, — no, nor any short path to heaven. The only path to the blissful seats, with which we are acquainted, is the path of repentance and regeneration; and these operations, we believe, cannot be radically performed, but by the power of the Lord Jesus Christ, believed in as the Way, the Truth, and the Life, received in humility, and combined with hearty obedience on the part of man. The law that regulates admission into the New Church or New Jerusalem, is, that “that there shall in no wise enter therein any thing that is unclean, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie †;” by which we understand, that whosoever would be benefitted by the new dispensation of the everlasting gospel, must regulate his life, from his inmost thoughts to his outmost deeds, by the immutable laws of order contained in the divine commandments; especially laboring to remove from his affections whatsoever is inconsistent with the love and purity of the heavenly kingdom, and from his thoughts or opinions whatever is disowned by the Divine Truth, which constitutes the law of that kingdom; and this he must do in humble dependence upon, and devout elevation of his mind to, the Lord Jesus Christ, as Him who ever reigns in that kingdom, the King of kings and Lord of lords. We do not believe then that a new dispensation of the everlasting gospel is offered to man, to contradict, in the slightest degree, former dispensations, but to fulfill them, by introducing into them their proper spirit and life. We are convinced, that they who embrace the new dispensation should walk in newness of the spirit, not in oldness of the letter; that as all former dispensations have required men to love God and keep his commandments, so in this they must do so from a deeper ground in the heart, and with more entire conformity in their practice. Thus we believe that the distinguishing superiority of the new dispensation will consist solely in these things: — the superior clearness with which the person and nature of the

* Matt. xvi. 23.

† Rev. xxi. 27.

God who is therein to be worshipped will be seen, with a more plain discovery of the way in which an acceptable service can be offered to him ; combined with the more powerful communication of a divine influence from him, enabling those who acknowledge him to fight successfully against their own corruptions, and so to render to him this acceptable service. Whilst then we point out to mankind the signs which demonstrate that the Second Coming of the Lord is arrived, we do not mean to fill their heads with idle fancies of no one knows what ; but to enforce upon them the fact, that now are they called, more unequivocally than at any former period, to acknowledge the only true God, and to be assured that the first of all the commandments is, to love the Lord our God with all the heart, soul, mind, and strength, and that the second is like unto it — to love our neighbor as ourselves. We only wish to urge upon them the necessity of becoming such servants of God and such friends of mankind, by the assurance that every divine aid is offered that will enable them to do so. If this be enthusiasm, it is an enthusiasm, allow me to say, which every sincerely well disposed mind ought by all means to foster ; it is an enthusiasm which every friend of humanity ought to desire should become universal : for it is an enthusiasm which, if once made universal, would speedily banish evil and misery from the earth, and bring on halcyon days of universal contentment and peace.

SECTION III.

THE RESURRECTION.

PART I.

The True Doctrine Proposed, and Texts cited in Opposition Considered.

THE next subject which seems most naturally to demand our attention, after having considered that of the Second Coming of the Lord, is that of the Last Judgment ; for that the execution of the Last Judgment must accompany the arrival of the Second Advent, is universally believed by Christians, and is most plainly announced in the word of God. But here a question of great importance arises ; — Where is to be the scene of the last judgment ? — is it to be accomplished in the natural or in the spiritual world ? As the common opinion is, not

only, as the apostle declares, that man is to be judged “for the things done in the body,” but also, beyond what either the Apostle or any other divine authority has declared, that he is to be judged *in* the body, the general expectation is, that the body is to be called out of the tomb for this purpose; and, consequently, that the scene of the last judgment is to be in this world of nature. The Scriptures have conducted *us* to a quite different conclusion. We are satisfied, upon their authority, which here assuredly coincides with the plainest dictates of reason, that when the body is laid aside by death, we have done with it forever; that man then becomes a living inhabitant of a spiritual world in which he is to continue his existence for ever; and that, consequently, the Last Judgment can only be accomplished in the world in which all the human race are collected together,—that is, in the spiritual world, and not in the natural world, to which they who have once quitted it will return no more. Before then you can decide upon the subject of the Last Judgment, it is necessary that I should appeal to you upon that of the Resurrection.

Allow me, then, to state, in a few words, the sum of our views upon this subject; they being such as we think are peculiarly adapted to recommend themselves, independently of all argument, to the Serious and the Reflecting.

We believe the true doctrine of the Scriptures, upon the important question of the Resurrection, to be this: That man rises from the grave,—not merely from the grave in the earth, but from the grave of his dead material body, immediately after death; that he then finds himself in a world, not of mere shadows, but of substantial existences, himself being a real and substantial man, in perfect human form, possessing all the senses and powers proper to a man, though he is no longer visible to men in this world, whose senses and capacities of perception are comparatively dull and gross, owing to their being still shrouded over with a gross body of unapprehensive clay.*

The latter part of this assertion, that the spirit of a man is a real substance, though not a material substance, and thus is the man himself, is capable of being proved, as may perhaps appear in the sequel, by most conclusive arguments, both from reason and Scripture: but, I will here confine myself to the former part of the doctrine;—that man rises from the dead immediately after death. Virtually, this includes the other.

* See this statement, and other parts of this Section, explained and vindicated in “*Strictures*” upon a pamphlet by a Mr. T. Spencer, inserted by me in the *Intellectual Repository and New Jerusalem Magazine*, vol. iii. for 1834 and 1835, pp. 422—432, 582—594, and 656—663.

Permit me, then, here to give vent to my own feelings, by saying, that this is indeed a most "glorious and heart-cheering doctrine;" whereas to suppose, with our opponents, that there is no real resurrection except the resurrection of the body, is to open the door to the most dark and gloomy apprehensions. What is become of the first inhabitants of this globe, and all who lived before the flood? Can any one seriously suppose, that they are out of existence, or, at best, have only a very imperfect and uncomfortable existence, because destitute of that body which has been undistinguishably mixed with the elements for five thousand years? and that they are still to pine for no one knows how many thousand years longer, before they will be themselves again, or can enjoy the happiness which Scripture everywhere promises to the saints, without anywhere hinting at the immeasurably long, dreary interval of suspense, which they are to languish through before they can enjoy it? How does such a notion comport with the answer of the Lord Jesus Christ to the carnal-minded Sadducees, half whose doctrine, at least, has been translated into the creed of the opposers of the New Church: for the Sadducees, affirmed, "that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit*:" and the opposers of the New Church, such at least as the one I have now chiefly in my eye†, affirm, that there is no real resurrection but that of the body. But is not the answer of the Lord Jesus Christ to the ancient Sadducees, an answer to these modern ones likewise? "Now that the dead are raised," saith he, "even Moses" — Moses, who never openly treats of the subject,— but "even Moses showed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob: for he is not the God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto him."‡ Is not this affirming, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were living at the very time that this was written of them by Moses,—that they were not then slumbering in their graves? Most truly does an accuser say, "that the doctrine of the resurrection may justly be called the key-stone of the gospel dispensation:" but to say, that the doctrine of the resurrection of *the body* is so, is grossly to pervert the plain meaning of the gospel-teaching. This writer, in his zeal for his body of clay, goes so far as to affirm, that to deny, not *the resurrection*, observe, but the resurrection of *the body*, if it is not the sin against the Holy Ghost,

* Acts xxiii. 8.

† I allude to the Rev. Mr. Beaumont, whose "Anti-Swedenborg" called forth the first edition of this "Appeal;" and where I make any adverse quotations, without specifically naming the author, it is from that publication that they are taken. I notice none, however, but what in substance, are common to most of our adversaries.

‡ Luke xx. 37, 38. See this subject fully examined in *Strictures, &c. Intellectual Repository* for 1835, pp 428—431.

is, in his serious opinion, something very near it! and then, as if determined to cut us off from all hope of salvation, he adds, “to hear Christ say, ‘*I will raise him up at the last day,*’ and then tacitly [as he means to say we do] to give Christ the lie” (such is his shocking expression!) “must be a crime of no common description.”* But who that knows the use of language, would call the material body *him*? The Lord is not here speaking of the body, but of the *man*; “I will raise *him* up at the last day:” not, “I will send his soul from heaven to gather up the ashes of his body. The words at length are, “This is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day.”†—Is it *the body* which thus seeth and believeth?

That man is not to slumber in a state of insensibility till the last day of the world, but that it is the last day with every man when he dies, is evident from the manner in which the Lord corrects Martha’s mistaken notion respecting it. “Jesus saith unto her, Thy brother shall rise again. Martha saith unto him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection *at the last day.*”‡ Here Jesus perceives that she had in her mind only the notion of a distant resurrection; wherefore he replies, “I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live, and he that liveth and believeth in me, *shall never die.*”§ Here, because, in the divine idea, no life but spiritual life is worthy of the name, the privilege of enjoying it is confined to believers; but of these the divine Saviour declares, that their life *shall never be perceptibly interrupted*. They have begun to live here, and they shall live on to eternity,—“they *shall NEVER die.*” To affirm, then, that there is no real resurrection but the resurrection of the body, and to apply all that is said upon the subject in Scripture to this imaginary resurrection; to affirm particularly, that it is the resurrection of the body which the Lord means, when he says, I will raise him up at the last day;—I will not adopt the coarse and profane language employed against us, by saying it is giving Christ the lie,—but I must say, it is not only directly contradicting him, but is making him contradict himself. Jesus Christ affirms, that he who believeth in him shall *never die*; and to prevent men from wondering how this can be, when men do die, to all appearance, at the close of their life in the world, he as-

* Anti-Swedenborg, p. 50.

† John vi. 40. See *Strictures*, &c., *ibid*, pp. 583—589.

‡ John xi. 23, 24. See this text largely illustrated as above, pp. 589—591, and the Scripture meaning of *the last day*, pp. 591—594.


§ Ver. 26.

sures them, *that at the last day of this life they shall be transplanted into life eternal*: — Every one that seeth the Son and believeth on him, shall have *everlasting life*, and I will raise him up at the last day.” That would be a strange sort of everlasting life, which was to be interrupted by an interval of no one knows how many thousands of years. Even supposing that the body was to live again, it is quite evident that it is not *the life of the body* of which the Lord is speaking, when he speaks of *everlasting life*, since the life of the body is not, upon any hypothesis, an everlasting life: consequently, it is not the body of which he speaks when he says, “I will raise him up at the last day.” The whole declaration is only applicable to the Spirit, which is the man himself, to which the body is only an instrument of service while he remains in a world and state where its services are required; “The flesh,” as the Lord says in the same discourse, “profiteth nothing.”* The spirit only is the real man: it is of the spirit only that *life everlasting* can be predicated: it is this only that can be raised to the eternal world; and this resurrection, the Lord assures us, the spirit shall experience not after a sleep of ages, or at best a state for ages of half-conscious existence, but, in all the vigor of true life, as soon as it is emancipated from the shell of clay.

Some, however, applying to the flesh all that is said in the Scriptures of the true resurrection, hesitate not to add reviling to their anathemas against those who can find in the Scriptures no such sentiment. “A doctrine” says one, “so glorious — so awfully sublime, so clearly taught in the sacred records [where it is not once mentioned] — so universally believed from the beginning of the Christian era [he might have said, — *before* the beginning of the Christian era, — for it is a purely Jewish doctrine, and from the Jews those Christians who did believe it received it] — so commonly believed by all sects and denominations of Christians even in our day, with the exception of Swedenborgians, who, as many will think, deserve not the name of Christians; this blessed doctrine, I say, is not to be given up at the *ipse dixit* of a madman,” &c.† I make no remark upon the liberality and Christian candor of such observations, but appeal to you, my reflecting readers, to judge of them as they may deserve. But why is it that most Christians at this day hold the doctrine of the resurrection of the body? I answer, Because they have not searched the Scriptures for themselves, but finding much said in the Scriptures respecting a resurrection, and having been told from their childhood that the body is to rise again, they conclude, with our accuser, that the resurrection spoken of is the resurrection of the body. And as we, for

* John vi. 63.

† Anti-Swedenborg, p. 49.



denying it, are to be put out of the pale of Christianity ; and because our accusers find it convenient to call the intelligent Swedenborg, who proves it falsehood, a madman ; — (though the present writer admits that a man who could write as he did could not have been very mad, though he thinks he must have been a little mad ;*) as, for these reasons, nothing that we can allege against it from Scripture or reason is to be listened to for a moment, we will call another witness. It will not be said, I suppose, that the great reasoner Locke, — the author of a work on the Reasonableness of Christianity, was not a Christian, or that he was a madman : and this great man has left on record, a testimony of the conclusion to which every rational man, and every unprejudiced Christian, must come, who candidly examines the subject for himself. In his *Third Letter to the Bishop of Worcester*, cited also in the note at the end of the chapter on Identity and Diversity, in his *Essay on the Human Understanding*, he says, “ The resurrection of the dead I acknowledge to be an article of the Christian faith : but that the resurrection of the same body, in your Lordship’s sense of the same body, is an article of the Christian faith, is what, I confess, I do not yet know. In the New Testament (wherein I think, are contained all the articles of the Christian faith,) I find our Saviour and the apostles to preach the resurrection of the dead, and the resurrection from the dead, in many places : but I do not remember any place where *the resurrection of the same body is so much as mentioned* ; nay, which is very remarkable in the case, I do not remember, in any place of the New Testament, (where the general resurrection of the last day is spoken of,) any such expression as *the resurrection of the body*, much less of *the same body*.” At the conclusion of a long series of powerful remarks, some more of which I shall have occasion to quote, Mr. L. adds, what many would find a useful caution against a too great facility in taking for granted, that all that is usually delivered as the doctrine of Scripture really is such. “ I must not part with this article of the resurrection,” says he, “ without returning my thanks to your Lordship for making me take notice of a fault in my Essay. When I wrote that book, *I took it for granted*, as I doubt not but many others have done, *that the Scriptures had mentioned, in express terms, the resurrection of the body* : — but upon the occasion your Lordship has given me, in your last letter, to look a little more narrowly into what revelation has declared concerning the resurrection, and *finding no such express words in Scripture, as that ‘ the body shall rise,*

* “ It does appear to many, that either much learning, or something else unknown, had made Baron Swedenborg mad, *if not in the highest, yet in a lower degree*.” Anti-S. p. 6. And in pp. 7 and 8 some important doctrines of Swedenborg’s are admitted to be excellent.

or be raised, or the resurrection of the body, I shall in the next edition of it change these words of my book, 'the dead bodies of men shall rise,'—into those of Scripture, 'the dead shall rise.' " Afterwards, in strict agreement with our sentiments, which affirm that man rises with a real substantial body, though not with a material body, Mr. Locke adds, " Not that I question that the dead shall be raised with bodies ; but in matters of revelation I think it not only safest, but our duty, as far as any one delivers it for revelation, to keep close to the words of Scripture ; unless he will assume to himself the authority of one inspired, or make himself wiser than the Holy Spirit himself."

In these few sentences, it must, I think, be generally felt, that Mr. Locke has fully anticipated all the arguments of our accusers as professed to be drawn from Scripture, and has shown that the passages adduced by them as proving their favorite notion, in reality prove no such thing. Whether Mr. Locke's own views on the subject were in all respects correct, is unimportant ; he has sufficiently evinced, that the doctrine of the resurrection of the body cannot be proved by Scripture. We will, however, run over the texts most frequently brought against us, to demonstrate that Mr. Locke is right in his assertion,—that not one of them speaks of any resurrection of the body.

The first three of the texts so commonly adduced are taken from a class of testimony which Mr. Lock would not admit in this case,—the books of the Old Testament ; for, certainly, whenever the writers of the Old Testament speak of a resurrection, they speak of it in a manner so evidently figurative, that no judicious person would rely much upon an argument drawn from the literal sense of their expressions. It is true that the Lord Jesus Christ draws thence an argument against the Sadducees, which we receive as most conclusive evidence of the reality of a resurrection, and that it takes place immediately after death ; but here we have the Old Testament expounded by an infallible Interpreter, and we receive the important truth upon the authority of the Interpreter, rather than because it is plain, to ordinary apprehensions, in the text from which he deduces it. Indeed, we are authoritively assured by the writers of the New Testament, that the doctrine of the resurrection is not in the books of the Old Testament, openly revealed. The Apostle's assertion that " life and immortality were brought to light through the gospel," would not be true, if life and immortality had been brought to light under the law. In defiance, however, of the authority of the Apostles, many would fain have us believe, not only that the doctrine of the

resurrection, but that of the resurrection of the body, may be clearly proved from the Old Testament.

How often is the array of texts on this subject opened with the celebrated passage of Job! "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though, after my skin, *worms* destroy this *body*, yet in my flesh shall I see God: whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me."* This text, however, which is commonly understood to teach the resurrection of the body, affords a remarkable instance of the mistakes into which it is easy to run, when we read Scripture with preconceived opinions in our minds. For who does not see, whose eyes are not closed by his preconceived opinions, that this text has nothing at all to do with the subject? Job is here speaking of the wretched state of affliction to which he was then reduced, and declaring his confidence that God would interpose to deliver him *before his death*,—not at the end of the world. We read in chap. ii., that Satan, after having grievously afflicted Job in his property and family, demanded "permission to touch his bone and his flesh," and that he smote Job with sore boils from the sole of his foot unto his crown." Accordingly, Job complains, a few verses before those just quoted, of being wasted away to mere skin and bone; which he expresses by saying, "My bone cleaveth to my skin, as to my flesh, and I am escaped with the skin of my teeth."† Because his friends reproached him, imputing his misfortunes to his wickedness, he adds, "Have pity upon me, have pity upon me, O my friends! for the hand of God hath touched me. Why do ye persecute me as God, and are not satisfied with my flesh?"‡—that is, why still treat him as though he had not been sufficiently punished, though his flesh was all wasted away. Wherefore he proceeds to express his confidence, that notwithstanding their uncharitable judgment of him, he may still rely on God as his Vindicator, Redeemer or Deliverer, and that God will at last appear in his behalf; *not at the last day of the world*, (neither does the word *day* occur in the original,) but *at the conclusion of his state of trial*. When he adds, "and though, after my skin, worms destroy this body, [where, likewise, neither *worms* nor *body* are mentioned in the original,] yet in my flesh shall I see God;" he does not mean to comfort himself with the thought, that though his body must now die, it will rise again, and he shall see God, in his flesh, perhaps ten thousand years afterwards; but he expresses his confidence that, though wasted to a shadow, *he shall not die*, but shall see God interpose in his be-

* Job xix. 25, 26, 27.

† Ch. xix. 20.

‡ Ver. 21, 22.

ha f *while he is still living in the flesh* and has not put it off by death. Therefore he adds, that he shall see God for himself, and his own eyes shall behold him and not another's; meaning that God will not put off the vindication of his innocence till after his death, in which case, though another might see justice done him, it would be no benefit to himself, but that he himself shall experience the deliverance; and this notwithstanding his anguish, mental and bodily, was aggravated to such a degree, that as he adds, "his reins are consumed within him." Accordingly, all this pious confidence of his was justified by the event, and his hopes were completely fulfilled. At the end of the book, God himself, is represented as interposing. In the passage we have been considering, Job says, "*In my flesh shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another:*" In the last chapter he says, "I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, but now *mine eye seeth thee.*"* In the passage we have been considering, Job declares his reliance that he should see God interfere *as his Redeemer or Deliverer*; in the last chapter, God does interfere in this character;" and the Lord *turned the captivity of Job*, when he prayed for his friends: also the Lord *gave Job twice as much as he had before.*" "And after this lived Job a hundred and forty years, and saw his sons, and his sons' sons, even four generations. So Job died, being old and full of days."† Can the parallelism between the expectation and the accomplishment be more complete? What violence then is done to the text, when the conclusion of the history is disregarded, and Job's hopes are referred to an imaginary resurrection of his body! Surely, to put this text in the front, to prove the resurrection of the body when it has no relation to a resurrection of any sort, is equivalent to an acknowledgment, that the resurrection of the body is not a doctrine of the Scriptures.

So plain, indeed, is it, that this text of Job has nothing to do with the subject, that this acknowledgment has forced itself on the most eminent of those who contend for the resurrection of the body. This admission, for instance, is made by the learned Dr. Hody, the author of the celebrated work, *De Bibliorum Textibus Originalibus*, in his work entitled, *The Resurrection of the Same Body Asserted*: and he cites, to the same purport, the following remarks of Grotius, which I translate as closely as possible: "Not a few Christians have used this text to prove the resurrection: but to do this, they are compelled in their versions to depart much from the Hebrew, as has been observed by Mercer and others." The Hebrew, adds Grotius, "is to this effect: 'I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he at

* Chap. xlii. 5.

† Ver. 10, 16, 17.

last will stand in the field (that is, will be victor). Although they (his distempers) should not only consume my skin, but also this, (namely, the fat which is under the skin), nevertheless in my flesh I shall see God (that is shall experience his favor): I, I say, with these my eyes, I, not another for me. My reins have failed within me, (that is, my inmost parts are devoured with indignation at your reproaches).’” — Dr. Hody, having observed “that Bishop Pearson calls this exposition ‘a very new one:’” adds, “But in that he is mistaken, for ’tis no more than what St. Chrysostom long ago thought on, and did not dislike.” The fact is, that this passage was only known, to the early Christians, through the medium of very inaccurate translations; and having been once applied to the doctrine of the Resurrection, and prescriptively regarded as belonging to that subject, it afterwards required no small share of learning to discover, and of resolution, as well as of candor, to acknowledge, the impropriety of the application. Hence, though the discovery of its inapplicability has long since been made, few are willing to confess it; and it still continues to be cited as pertinent to the question, though it now yields an argument only to the ignorant.*

The next citation presented for notice is the following: “Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth; my flesh also shall rest in hope; for thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption.”† This, however, is so palpably beside the question, that it is needless to waste words in exposing its inapplicability. The declaration is made respecting a Holy Being, whose body was not to see corruption: but the bodies of all men do see corruption: consequently, this declaration does not relate to the bodies of men in general. Probably, then, most readers will prefer, to the application of the words adopted by our adversaries, the application of them by the Apostle Peter: “Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore, being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he, seeing this before, *spake of the Resurrection of CHRIST, that HIS soul was not left in hell, neither HIS flesh did see corruption.*’ ‡ Such was the force of this reasoning, that three thousand souls were converted by it: but the argument

* See this text of Job, and other passages from the same book, examined at large in the *Intellectual Repository* for 1825, pp. 649—651; and for 1826, pp. 148—156.

† Ps. xvi. 9, 10.

‡ Acts ii. 29, 30, 31.

was a mere sophism, and they who yielded to it were not converted but entrapped, if, as some would pretend, the words are as true of David, and of every other mortal, as of the Lord Jesus Christ.

A text more plausibly applied to this question is cited from Daniel ; where also, though it is not so obviously remote from the subject, a little reflection may convince any one, that the prophet is not speaking of the resurrection of the body. He says, "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." * Now most people believe, that whether the body rises again or not, the resurrection extends to *all* whose bodies are deposited in the dust : yet this passage only says, that *many* of them that sleep in the dust shall awake : and this difficulty is so insurmountable, that the more candid of the advocates for the resurrection of the body acknowledge that this passage cannot relate to the subject. If we are to abide strictly by the letter in the words *sleeping in the dust*, we must abide by the letter in the word *many* : hence, if we make the passage say, that many of the bodies which lie in the dust shall be raised, we make it say as positively that some of them shall not be raised : and thus we involve the whole in contradiction. Dr. Hody, who was so anxious to find evidence for the resurrection of the body, that he often adduces such as is extremely equivocal, nevertheless considers that this passage of Daniel is best referred to the restoration of the Jews, or of the church, being excluded from reference to a general resurrection, by the introduction of the word *many* : and his arguments are well worth notice. "I most freely acknowledge," he says, "that the word *many* makes this text extremely difficult. I know what expositors say ; but I am not satisfied with anything that I have hitherto met with. Some tell us that *many* is sometimes used in the Scriptures to signify *all* :—but this does not clear the difficulty. For there is a great difference between *many*, and *many of*. *All* they that sleep in the dust are *many* ; but *many of* them that sleep in the dust cannot be said to be *all* they that sleep in the dust.—*Many of* does plainly except *some*."—Being still, however, reluctant to give up this passage as a proof of his favorite sentiment, Dr. Hody acknowledges, that as the text could not be accommodated to the doctrine, he was once disposed to accommodate the doctrine to the text. "I was once," says he, "inclined to believe, and the fancy was grounded upon this text, that *there may be some who shall not be raised up at all at the last day* ; and who were they, think you, who I fancied were not to rise? Such heath-

* Acts, xii, 2.

ens as lived morally well, and according to the light that is given them. I was loth to rank them among the miserable ; and I could not see how they could be saved. I was willing therefore, to believe that there might be some middle way contrived by Providence ; and that was annihilation." An admirable expedient, indeed ! which at once relieves the mind from the pain attending the horrid notion so generally prevalent, that nothing but eternal fire is reserved even for the best of that immense portion of mankind who have not been visited by the light of the gospel, and converts this text of Daniel into good proof of the resurrection of the body ! Dr. Hody, however, was too honest to be satisfied with such a subterfuge ; wherefore we will leave it to those who are not so candid, or so scrupulous.

To sleep, and to sleep in the dust, are phrases belonging to that peculiar style of language in which the Scriptures are written, and which is framed from the correspondence, analogy, or mutual relation, established by the Creator between natural things and spiritual ; which is such, that the former regularly answer to the latter, and afford exact images for giving them expression ; as I have endeavored to explain in a distinct work on that subject. In this style of language, to sleep, and to sleep in the dust, mean, to be in a merely natural and sensual state of life ; and to awake from this state to everlasting life, is to arise to a state of truly spiritual life, accompanied with eternal happiness ; while to awake to shame and everlasting contempt, is indeed to pass into a spiritual state, but such a one as belongs to infernal spirits, accompanied with eternal misery. Thus to sleep in the dust, and to awake thence, have no reference whatever to the unconscious dead body, but to the man, of whom the dead body no longer forms any part. Hence we read, both of the wise and foolish virgins, that while the bridegroom tarried, they all *slumbered and slept*, and surely no one ever referred the expressions, in this instance, to the body in the grave. So when the Apostle, paraphrasing the prophet, says, "*Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light ;*"* he certainly does not allude to the sleep of the grave, or address the dead bodies there, but calls those who are slumbering in a merely natural state, and who are spiritually dead, to arise to a state of spiritual light and life. Thus, also, when Isaiah exclaims, "*Shake thyself from the dust ; arise, and sit down, O Jerusalem ;*"† none understand the call to be addressed to the dead bodies of the Jewish people mouldering in the dust of the grave. Equally unfounded is the application of this prophecy

* Eph. v. 14.

† Isa. lii. 2.

of Daniel, respecting *them that sleep in the dust*, to dead carcases in the tomb.

In the preceding paragraph I have explained the above text of Daniel according to its spiritual sense, because I am of opinion that it really does relate, as they who apply it to the resurrection of the body suppose, to the last judgment; and it is only in its spiritual sense that it refers to that event. But they who apply it to the resurrection of the body take it in its merest literal sense. That it has also, subordinately, a literal or natural sense, I readily admit: but in that sense it certainly relates neither to the resurrection of the body nor to the last judgment. Let any one examine the context, and then decide whether, in the literal sense, it can possibly refer to the last judgment; if not, neither can it, even in that sense, refer to the resurrection of the body. The preceding chapter is occupied with an account of the wars between the king of the south and the king of the north; and these were understood, by all the ancient commentators, to be the Greek kings of Egypt and of Syria: indeed, so well do the predictions apply to the affairs of those princes and times, that the celebrated philosopher and opposer of Christianity, Porphyry, made the very exactness of the prophecy an argument against its truth, pretending that it must have been written after the events had come to pass. Thus, according to the ancient interpreters, as may be seen in Prideaux and others, the eleventh chapter ends with the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, whom most of them regarded as a type of Antichrist. The death of Antiochus took place in the 164th year before the Christian Era; and in the year preceding, Judas Maccabæus, having delivered his country from the power of her oppressors, purified and repaired the temple, and founded the feast of the Dedication; which I mention, because the observance of this feast by the Saviour himself, (John x. 22), seems to include a recognition of the importance, and indeed of the divine origin, of the reform and restoration effected by Judas. Now the eleventh chapter of Daniel having ended with the death of Antiochus, the twelfth chapter begins with declaring, that the Jews should experience a deliverance at the same time: "*And at that time,*" it reads, "shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth up for the children of thy [Daniel's] people [the Jews]: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and *at that time* thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book." This certainly appears very suitable, in its literal sense, to the deliverance which the Jews obtained, after the dreadful oppressions they had previously undergone, by the in-

strumentality of Judas Maccabæus, co-incident as this was with the end of the reign of Antiochus: accordingly, this part of the prophecy also, is thus applied by the ancient interpreters. Well then; *in the outward sense, the passage respecting them that sleep in the dust, must be a figurative description of some of the circumstances which then took place; for* it immediately follows the words last cited. In this application, doubtless, they that slept in the dust, were they who had submitted to their heathen masters and conformed to the manners and worship of their oppressors, as the latter rigorously required; they who awoke to everlasting life, were they who sincerely returned to, and assisted in re-establishing, the worship of the true God, and thus obtained everlasting honor in this world and happiness in the next: and they who awoke to shame and everlasting contempt, were they who, having become heathens in heart as well as in manners, opposed the efforts of their countrymen to obtain emancipation, and thus incurred everlasting disgrace both here and hereafter. But certainly, no bodies of Jews deceased then arose, either to promote or oppose the noble labors of Judas.

In just conformity then with the ancient scheme of literal interpretation, this passage can have nothing to do with the doctrine of the resurrection of the body.

Nor do the schemes of literal interpretation which many recent expositors have substituted for the ancient one, make this text at all more applicable to that doctrine. It has become the fashion to explain the latter part of the eleventh chapter in reference to events of modern times, and to read, in the first verse of the twelfth, the promise of a restoration of the Jews which is yet future, but which many believe to be immediately at hand; and the prediction respecting them that sleep in the dust, is then necessarily understood as figuratively describing the state of the Jews, and their conduct, at the period of this expected restoration. It is expressly so applied by Mr. Faber and others. But certainly, though the Jews themselves suppose that when they return to Canaan, the bodies of all their deceased countrymen will arise and go with them, no Christian concurs in so extravagant an expectation.

Thus, upon no consistent scheme of interpretation whatever, can this verse be made to relate to an actual revival of dead bodies.

We now pass, for the present, from the evidence of the Old Testament to that of the New: and though we shall here find explicit documents on the subject of the resurrection, we shall find Mr. Locke's assertion to be true, that it, likewise, never speaks of the resurrection of the same [or the material] body.

The first passage to be here noticed, is one which has been much relied on by the advocates of the resurrection of the body; and yet it is attended with particulars, in itself and in its context, which make it utterly irreconcilable with that doctrine. "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation."* The specific reference of these words we shall probably see when we come to consider the subject of the Last Judgment; but that they do not relate to any resurrection of deceased bodies, to take place many hundreds, probably many thousands of years after the words were uttered, is evident from this circumstance; that the great event referred to, whatever may be its true nature, is spoken of in the present tense, — the hour *is coming*, — indicating, that the event was immediately about to take place. This is the usual import of the verb to *come* when used in the present tense, both in common language and in the language of Scripture. If the Divine Speaker had been referring to an event so distant as experience has now proved that the resurrection of the body, if ever it takes place, must then have been, he would not have said, "the hour *is coming*;" but "the hour *will come*;" as when he says, in Luke, "The days *will come* when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man:" — when he says, the hour *cometh*, or *is coming*," he certainly means, *is presently at hand*."† But if the mode of expression be not itself deemed sufficient to put this beyond all doubt, all doubt must vanish when the parallel passage, three verses previous, is consulted, of which this is only a more detailed repetition. The Lord there says, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour *is coming*, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live.'‡ Certainly, "the dead," "all that are in the graves," — cannot mean, literally, corpses in the tomb; for all these have never yet heard the voice of the Son of God, lived, and come forth; although the Lord declares that the hour of which he was speaking, when this should take place, *then was*. Whatever then may be intended by these divine declarations, we here have conclusive proof, that they do not announce the resurrection of the body. The language of the Divine Speaker must be figurative; in fact, it is that of analogy or correspondence. This is further evident from the next verse preceding, which introduces the subject: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and

* John v. 28.

† See, for instance, John iv. 21 and 23.

‡ Ver. 25.

believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but *is passed from death unto life.*”* Here, those who are in a merely natural state, are spoken of as being in a state of death, notwithstanding they are living by natural life in the world. This evinces, that it is not of natural death that the Divine Teacher is speaking; consequently, “the dead,” mentioned directly afterwards, are not they who are naturally dead, and “all that are in the graves” are not the dead bodies in the tomb.†

But it not only is evident, upon comparing the context, that “all that are in the graves,” cannot mean all dead bodies, but it is shown by Mr. Locke, in the place cited above, that the words themselves, could they be separated from the context, cannot, without the greatest inconsistencies, be applied to such a resurrection. It is to be observed that his antagonist, Stillingfleet, bishop of Worcester, though contending for the resurrection of *the same body*, had found it necessary, with all other advocates of that opinion, to define *the same body* not to be *the same individual particles of matter as were united at the point of death* but *the same individual particles of matter as were some time or other, during man’s life here, vitally united to his soul*. To prove the resurrection of the same body, he quotes the above text. “From whence,” says Mr. Locke, “your Lordship argues, That these words, ‘all that are in the graves,’ relate to no other substance than what was united to the soul in life; because a different substance cannot be said to be in the graves, and to come out of them. Which words of your Lordship’s, if they prove any thing, prove that *the soul too is lodged in the grave, and raised out of it the last day*. For your Lordship says, ‘Can a different substance be said to be in the graves, and to come out of them?’ So that, according to this interpretation of these words of our Saviour; *No other substance being raised but what hears his voice: and no other substance hearing his voice but what, being called, comes out of the grave; and no other substance coming out of the grave but what was in the grave; any one must conclude, that the soul, unless it be in the grave, will make no part of the person that is raised; unless, as your Lordship argues, against me, you can make it out, that a substance which never was in the grave may come out of it; or that the soul is no substance*. But,” adds Mr. L., “setting aside the substance of the soul, another thing that will make any one doubt whether this your interpretation

* John iv. 24.

† See the above explanation of this text, and of the use in Scripture of the expression *cometh*, or *is coming*, fully established in ‘*Strictures*,’ &c., *Int. Rep.* for 1835, pp. 658—663.

of our Saviour's words be necessary to be received as their true sense, is, That it will not be very easily reconciled to your saying, you do not mean, by the same body, *the same individual particles which were united at the point of death*. And yet, by this interpretation of our Saviour's words, you can mean *no other particles but such as were united at the point of death*; because you mean *no other substance but what comes out of the grave*, and no substance, no particles, come out, you say, but what *were in the grave*; and I think your Lordship will not say, that the particles that were separated from the body by perspiration, before the point of death, were laid up in the grave. But," Mr. L. adds further, "your Lordship, I find, has an answer to this; viz, *That by comparing this with other places, you find that the words* [of our Saviour above quoted] *are to be understood of the substance of the body to which the soul was united, and not of those individual particles that are in the grave at the resurrection*.—But methinks this last sense of our Saviour's words given by your Lordship, wholly overturns the sense which you have given of them above, where from these words you press the belief of the resurrection of the same body by this strong argument; *that a substance could not, upon hearing the voice of Christ, come out of the grave, which was never in the grave*. There (as far as I can understand your words) your Lordship argues, that our Saviour's words must be understood of the particles in the grave, *unless*, as your Lordship says, *one can make it out that a substance which never was in the grave, can come out of it*. And here your Lordship expressly says, That our Saviour's words *are to be understood of the substance of that body to which the soul was* [at any time] *united, and not of those individual particles that are in the grave*. Which, put together, seems to me to say, *That our Saviour's words ARE to be understood of those particles only that are in the grave, and NOT of those particles only that are in the grave, but of others also which have at any time been vitally united to the soul, but never were in the grave*." Mr. Locke has certainly here involved his eminent opponent in inextricable inconsistencies: nor can such inconsistencies be escaped by any one, who applies the above text to the resurrection of the same, or material body.

The next quotation formally brought forward is the Lord's discourse with Martha (John xi. 23—26) briefly noticed above: but how directly this contradicts the notion of a future resurrection of the body, instead of confirming it, we have already seen. It is true that, to strain it to this purpose, an accuser would translate the last clause, "*shall not die for ever*," instead of "*shall never die*:" but every one who is acquainted with

the idiom of the New Testament, knows that the words which, literally translated, are, "shall not die for ever," mean precisely the same as the English phrase, *shall never die*. By this phrase, therefore, our translators have honestly rendered them, notwithstanding they also, had a predilection for the notion, that everlasting life is to have a great chasm in it. As Dr. Doddridge justly observes, in his note upon this passage, "To render the words, — *shall not die for ever*, or *eternally*, is both obscuring and enervating their sense, and (as I have elsewhere shown, notes on John iv. 14, and John viii. 51, 52) is grounded on a criticism which cannot agree with the use of the phrase in parallel passages." The words expressly declare, that he who liveth and believeth in the Lord *shall never die*. Thus by this divine declaration, the change in the state of existence made by putting off the body is treated as unworthy of any regard. It is represented as not even making a break in the course of existence: and we may be satisfied that the Divine Giver of everlasting life does not mock us with empty words, and call that everlasting life, or living forever, which is presently to be discontinued, and, after a lapse of thousands of years, is to begin again!

Next we are presented with these words: "And as they spake unto the people, the priests, and the captains of the people, and the Sadducees, came upon them, being grieved that they taught the people, and preached through Jesus the resurrection from the dead."* No allusion here, we see, to any general resurrection of dead bodies: Indeed, this passage only refers to the resurrection of Jesus himself; for according to the original it is, — "and preached *in Jesus* the resurrection from the dead;" — that is, that in the person of Jesus a resurrection from the dead had taken place; in other words, that Jesus had risen from the dead; which certainly constituted the main burthen of the first preaching of the apostles. — Again: "Then certain philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoics encountered him (Paul). And some said, What will this babbler say? other some, He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods: because he preached to them Jesus and the resurrection."† Still nothing about the resurrection of the body: indeed, this text also seems only to refer to the resurrection of Jesus. — "And have hope towards God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust. — Except it be for this one voice, that I (Paul) cried standing among them, touching the resurrection of the dead I am called in question among you this day."‡ Still not a word about dead bodies. — "Women received their

* Acts iv. 1, 2.

† Ch. xvii. 18.

‡ Ch. xxiv. 15, 21.

dead raised to life again : and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance ; that they might obtain a better resurrection.”* Here the dead whom the women received again certainly were restored in their bodies ; they not only rose again in their bodies, but, as the necessary consequence of such a resurrection, they also died again in their bodies : but they hoped for a *better resurrection*, that is, *better than the resurrection of the body*. — “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.” Here, again, no resurrection is spoken of, but that of Jesus Christ.

“But the rest of the dead lived not again till the thousand years were finished : this is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection.”† This passage refers to events that were to take place in the spiritual world, not in the natural, at the time of the last judgment, wherefore I shall consider it when I come to treat of that subject. At present I will only cite a little more of it, which the refuter who quotes it has judiciously suppressed, because, if suffered to appear, it would take the whole passage completely out of his list of proofs, and add it to ours. The preceding verse says : “I saw the *souls*” (mind this — the *souls*, not the *bodies* ; — “I saw the *souls*) of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads or in their hands ; and *they* (not the *bodies*, mind, but *they*, the pronoun referring to the *souls* before mentioned as its antecedent), lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of *the dead*,” &c. Here then we find that these *souls* are called *the dead*, as having passed by death out of the natural world ; as well as for another reason that will be mentioned hereafter ; and as, while souls are mentioned, not a syllable is said of any bodies, or of the resurrection of the body, it surely is a palpable violation of the sacred text to apply this part of it to confirm such a notion.

The last passage which our present adversary adduces against us is this. “For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God : and the dead in Christ shall rise first.” I wonder he did not add the next verse, which appears still stronger : for the Apostle goes on to say : “Then we which are alive, and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air :”‡ But I suppose

* Heb. xi. 35.

† Rev. xx. 5, 6.

‡ Thes. iv. 16, 17.

the reason why this quotation is declined was, because the language is so evidently figurative, that scarcely any can suppose that it is meant to be literally understood: and because, also, the Apostle here *undeniably* speaks according to certain mistaken notions, which prevailed in the first ages. The fact is, that this text does not so properly belong to the subject of the Resurrection, as to that of the Second Coming of the Lord; and as, according to what has been shown in the preceding Section, the true nature of the Second Coming of the Lord was not at that time plainly revealed, therefore the Apostles never speak of it but in that prophetic style in which it had been predicted by the Lord himself, and which cannot be understood till spiritually deciphered.* Thus we have seen, that all the primitive Christians, and the Apostles themselves, believed that it was to take place in that first age; and the language which Paul here twice uses, — “*we that are alive and remain,*” — evinces, that he at the time of his so writing, entertained the expectation of living to see it. This, experience has proved, was a mistaken opinion altogether; yet with a reference to this mistaken opinion, assumed as true, all the Apostle’s remarks are here framed. The Thessalonian Christians expected to live to witness the Lord’s second coming, and then to be admitted into a kingdom of superlative glory, in a new heaven and earth to be created for the purpose after the destruction of the former: and they grieved for their deceased friends, fearing that none could enjoy the happiness of the Lord’s new kingdom, but they who lived to behold its establishment. Assuming then this expectation of the Lord’s appearing, in this manner, and in the life-time of that generation, to be true, the Apostle applies himself to remove their gloomy apprehensions respecting their departed friends. He opens the subject with saying, “But I would not have ye to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope: for if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that sleep in Jesus will God bring with him.”† Then he proceeds, “For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord” [meaning that he here repeats what the Lord himself had declared, Matt. xxiv. 30, 31], “that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent [be beforehand with, or have any advantage over] them which are asleep.”‡ The two verses cited above next follow; and they are purely a paraphrase of

* See above, p. 7—17; and I beg the reader to bear in mind what was there advanced, as the subject is of great importance, and what is here stated was there, I trust I may say, incontrovertibly proved.

† Ver. 13, 14.

‡ Ver. 15.

the Lord's own statement respecting his second coming, with the introduction of a clause respecting those who should be deceased, in regard to whom the Thessalonians were uneasy. The Lord had said, "They shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory: and he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other."* The Apostle says, "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first" [or "shall rise before," or "previously;" as in the sense of the word *proton* in Matt. v. 24, xii. 29, Mark ix. 11, 12, John xv. 18, xix. 39, 2 Thess. ii. 3, 1 Tim. iii. 10, &c.]: "then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air." Here, observe, that no raising of *dead bodies* is mentioned or alluded to. "Them that sleep in Jesus," it is said, "will God bring *with him*," not, "*will raise them from the grave to meet him*." As is well observed on this text by the celebrated Dr. Dwight: "Who are those whom God will bring with Christ at this time? Certainly, *not* the *bodies* of the saints." Dr. Dwight indeed adds, "They [the bodies] will be raised from the grave, and cannot be brought with Christ." But he only takes for granted that the bodies will be raised, from his preconceived notions: the Apostle says no such thing. But he comes to the right conclusion: "The only answer therefore is, he will bring with him 'the spirits of just men made perfect.'"[†]

Thus nothing can with certainty be here gathered from the Apostle's language, but that, as has been shown before, neither the manner nor the time of the Lord's second coming were then revealed. Hence, with respect to the manner of it, we find the Apostle repeating, without explanation, the symbolic language in which the Lord had foretold it; and with respect to the time of it, we find him countenancing a most palpable error. Can any doctrine, then, with safety be drawn from his statement, beyond this; that they who "sleep in Jesus," actually are "with him," — that is, that they are awake or alive towards him, though they are asleep towards us; or "that the dead in Christ were to rise" before his second coming, even though this was then daily expected, — in other words, that they rise in and with Christ as soon as they die here? And even if we understand as literally as we can the Apostle's words respecting the dead in Christ rising first, and *we* (which must now be changed into *they*) which are alive and remain being caught

* Matt. xxiv. 30, 31.

† Serm. 164.

up into the air, still it will not follow that dead *material* bodies are thus to rise, or that living *material* bodies are to be thus transported : for, when speaking in a similar manner in another place, to be considered presently, he says, that “we shall be *changed*” — shall change our material bodies for *spiritual* ones, — “in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye ;” evidently teaching that, happen how it may, we are to be dispossessed of that “flesh and blood,” which, he affirms in the same place, “cannot inherit the kingdom of God,” and which are so little suited for flying in the air.

SECTION III.

THE RESURRECTION.

PART II.

Other Texts, commonly regarded as adverse to the True Doctrine, considered.

In the First Part of this Section I have considered all the texts, cited as opposed to the View of the Resurrection which we receive as the truth of Scripture, in the work which I have taken as my guide in the composition of this Appeal. In making this remark, however, I except the famous fifteenth chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians ; which, regarding it as strongly affirming our view of the subject, I reserve till I enter on the consideration of texts by which that view is established. But first I will request the attention of the Candid and Reflecting, while I make the present branch of the subject more complete, by noticing all the remaining texts, both of the Old Testament and the New, which are commonly referred to the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body.

In the preceding part of this Section, among other texts from the Old Testament, I have examined the passage of Daniel, ch. xii. 2, which says, “And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt :” and it has been shown, that, “upon no consistent schème of interpretation whatever, can this verse be made to relate to an actual revival of dead bodies.

This image of a revival from the grave, is also used, by other prophets, to express the restoration of the Jews from a state of depression to a state of prosperity ; and as such passa-

ges are sometimes improperly cited, by the advocates of the resurrection of the body, in proof of that doctrine, we will here briefly pass them under review.

We will first notice Ezekiel's vision of dry bones, because, though inattentive readers are apt to suppose that it relates to a general resurrection of dead bodies, and some who ought to know better frequently apply it to that doctrine, it nevertheless explains itself so clearly, that it may serve as a key to all other passages in which similar images are used. Ezekiel was one of those, who, with Jehoiachin the king and a great body of the people, were carried captives to Babylon at the first capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. So long, however, as Jerusalem remained standing, and under the government of Jehoiachin's successor, Zedekiah, the captives in Babylon entertained hopes of a return, and of the restoration of the Jewish state to its pristine glory; but when Jerusalem was utterly destroyed, and the principal part of the people who remained was likewise carried into captivity, at the second invasion by Nebuchadnezzar, they abandoned themselves to despair, and regarded all prospect of a restoration as utterly hopeless: which they expressed, in the figurative language to which they were accustomed, by saying, "Our bones are dried, and our hope is lost; we are cut off, for our parts." To counteract this despair, Ezekiel is favored with the vision of dry bones. "The hand of the Lord," says he, "was upon me, and carried me out in the spirit of the Lord, and set me down in the midst of the valley which was full of bones;—and behold there were very many in the open valley; and lo, they were very dry. And he said unto me, Son of man, can these bones live? And I answered, O Lord God, thou knowest." The bones accordingly are clothed with flesh and skin, "and they lived and stood on their feet, an exceeding great army." (chap. xxxvii. 1—10). If the reader goes no further, he may conclude that this vision is intended to teach the doctrine of the resurrection of the body; but the prophet, or rather the Lord by the prophet, immediately declares, that the bones were symbols, not of actually deceased men, but of the Israelites in their then state of extreme affliction and depression, when they were held captive in the country of their enemies as dead bones in the grave; and that the revivification of the dry bones is a symbol of the certain revival of the Jewish state, by the restoration of the people to their own land; which, as is well known, took place accordingly, after the captivity had lasted seventy years. For thus the prophet continues: "Then he said unto me, Son of man, *these bones are the whole house of Israel*: behold they say, Our bones are dried, and our hope is lost; we are cut

off, for our parts. Therefore prophesy and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God: Behold, O my people, I will *open your graves*, and cause you to *come up out of your graves*, and *bring you into the land of Israel*, and ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have *opened your graves*, O my people, and *brought you up out of your graves*, and shall put my spirit within you, and ye shall live, and I shall *place you in your own land*: then shall ye know that I the Lord have spoken it, and performed it, saith the Lord" (ver. 11—14). In no other part of Scripture is so much said respecting the opening of graves, and bringing up out of graves; but, most evidently, this language does not here mean that there shall be any resurrection of actually dead bodies: consequently, it does not necessarily (perhaps I might say, it necessarily does not) mean such a resurrection, when it is used elsewhere.

Having thus obtained so distinct a clew to the signification of these images, we may easily understand them when they occur in other places.

Isa. xxvi. 19, as it stands in the common translation, appears more in favor of the resurrection of the body than any other text either of the Old or New Testament. "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out her dead." But for the main strength of this passage in reference to this argument, — its seeming mention of the dead body of Jesus Christ, as that together with which the other dead are to arise, — which would destroy its reference to any restoration of the Jews, it is entirely indebted to the ingenuity of the translators; which they in fact acknowledge, by printing the words *together with* in Italic characters, to indicate that nothing answering to them is to be found in the original. Indeed, they have herein departed likewise from all the ancient versions. The chapter consists of a song of praise for the delivery of the church and people of God, and the destruction of the enemies which had tyrannized over them: and, as in the preceding examples, to rise from the dead, and awake from the dust, are used as images to express their restoration from the extreme of depression. Of their enemies it is said in ver. 14; "They are dead, they shall *not* live; they are deceased, they shall *not* rise: therefore hast thou visited and destroyed them, and made *all their memory to perish*:" so that if the 19th verse did relate to the resurrection of the body, and could prove that the bodies of the people of God are to rise, from the grave, the 14th verse would prove that their enemies are never to arise again at all, but that when they die, they perish altogether: which alone evinces that the

resurrection, either with the body or without it, is not the subject treated of. It is to be observed also, that the word (*rephaim*) translated *deceased*, in ver. 14, always refers to such as exercise a tyrannical power, and is the same as that translated *the dead* at the end of ver. 19: which proves that *the dead whom the earth shall cast out*, mentioned at the end of that verse, are not the same as *the dead who shall live*, mentioned in the beginning of it: thus for the earth to cast out her dead, does not mean the resurrection of the dead, but the utter and final dispersion of their dust; so that, if the resurrection were the subject treated of, here also would be mention of some who are never to rise again at all. The true sense of the verse is given by Bishop Lowth, and is as follows:

“Thy dead shall live: my deceased, they shall arise:
Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust!
For thy dew is as the dew of the dawn;
But the earth shall cast forth as an abortion, the deceased tyrants.”

And the bishop gives this note upon it: “The deliverance of the people of God from a state of the lowest depression, is explained by images plainly taken from the resurrection of the dead. [As an example, he here refers to the passage of Ezekiel considered above. He then adds] And this deliverance is expressed with a manifest opposition to what is said above, ver. 14, of the great lords and tyrants under whom they had groaned:

‘They are dead, they shall not live;
They are deceased tyrants, they shall not rise:’

that they should be destroyed utterly, and should never be restored to their former power and glory.”

Plain enough, then, I apprehend it is, that this passage does not, cannot teach the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. Yet Bishop Lowth, after having so candidly and clearly given its true sense, would fain infer the resurrection of the body from it! To put the reader in possession of the whole of his sentiments, and as an extraordinary example of the power of prejudice over even the clearest understandings, I subjoin the remark with which he concludes his note: “It appears from hence, that the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead [meaning, it would seem, of the body] was at that time a popular and common doctrine: for an image which is assumed in order to express or represent any thing in the way of allegory or metaphor, whether poetical or prophetic, must be an image commonly known and understood; otherwise it will not answer the purpose for which it is assumed.” Is not this saying, that nothing must be used as an image in poetical or prophetic language, which is not at the same time a matter

of fact in common language? Might he not as well have said, because the Lord declares to him that overcometh, in the Revelation, "I will give him the morning star," — "It appears from hence, that the belief that the saints will be presented with stars was at that time a common and popular belief?" — or, because John says that he saw a woman clothed with the sun, — "It appears from hence, that to suppose that a woman might be clothed with the sun was at that time a common and popular supposition?" &c. The cases are exactly parallel, and one inference is as just as the other.

There are two other passages commonly cited from the Old Testament in proof of the resurrection of the body; but they are of precisely the same character as the above, and need not therefore detain us. The first is in Hosea vi. 2: "After two days will he revive us; in the third day he will raise us up; and we shall live in his sight." But here no mention is made of the body or the grave; and the preceding verse shows that it does not relate in any way to the literally dead: "Come, and *let us return unto the Lord*: for he hath torn, and he will heal us; he hath smitten and he will bind us up." Now it would be ridiculous to exhort dead bodies to return unto the Lord. The other passage is in the same prophet, ch. xiii. 14. "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction: repentance shall be hid from mine eyes." This is spoken of Ephraim; and an examination of the context will show that it can have no reference to the return of dead bodies from the tomb. Thus, in the words of Dr. Faber, "to express the political revivification of the house of Israel, Hosea, like Isaiah and Ezekiel, uses the allegory of a resurrection."

I have confined myself, in my remarks on the above passages, to their external or literal sense only; because if they do not refer to the resurrection of the body in that sense, they evidently cannot in any other: but, *we are* satisfied, that unless the prophecies contained a spiritual sense also, treating of matters far more important than the affairs of the Israelites and other nations, they could form no part of the word of God. As, in their external sense, such passages as the above treat of a political, so, in their spiritual sense, they must treat of a spiritual resurrection.

To pass to another subject: The translation of Enoch and Elijah is often referred to as supporting the notion of the final resurrection of the material body; for they are supposed to have been taken into heaven with their natural bodies, not having passed, in the ordinary manner, through the gate of death.

All that is recorded of Enoch, is this: "And Enoch lived sixty and five years, and begat Methuselah: and Enoch walked with God, after he begat Methuselah, three hundred years, and begat sons and daughters. And Enoch walked with God: and he was not, for God took him"(Gen. v. 21 — 24). This mode of relating the occurrence is so general and indistinct, that it is impossible to determine from it, even supposing that the history is to be literally understood, whether Enoch took his natural body into heaven or not. But the translation of Elijah is more particularly related: if then it shall appear, that from the translation of Elijah no inference can be drawn in favor of the resurrection of the material body, it will hardly be affirmed, that any such inference can be drawn from the less distinctly recorded translation of Enoch.

Quite evident, then, it is, that, whatever became of Elijah's material body, it was not carried up into heaven: for quite evident it is, though the circumstance is generally overlooked, that the translation of Elijah was not seen by Elisha with the eyes of his body, but with those of his spirit: on which mode of vision, customary with the prophets, we shall have to offer some remarks in a subsequent Section. Elisha had asked, that a double portion of his master's spirit might be upon him; to which Elijah answered, "Thou hast asked a hard thing: nevertheless, *if thou see me* when I am taken from thee, it shall be so unto thee; but *if not*, it shall not be so"(2 Kings ii. 10). Elijah knew that the miraculous event about to take place would be imperceptible to any man in his natural state, and could not be beheld by Elisha, unless, by special divine favor, the sight of his spirit were opened to behold it: the granting then to Elisha of the favor of the opening of his spiritual sight, was to be to him the earnest of the granting to him likewise of the other favor which he had requested. This therefore was done, and is distinctly recorded. "And it came to pass, as they still went on, and talked, that, behold, there appeared a chariot of fire and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder; and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven"(Ver. 11). Certain it is that this chariot and horses of fire did not belong to the natural world, but that they were a spiritual appearance, and consequently, not visible to the sight of a man, unless he were put into a spiritual state proper for beholding it. That Elisha then was put into such a state, is intimated by its being immediately added, "And Elisha *saw it*;" — that is, saw the whole transaction, — both the fiery chariot and horses and the transit of Elijah; — "and he cried, my father, my father, the chariot of Israel, and the horsemen thereof." This vision having been granted him, his return into a natural state, in which objects belonging to the spiritual world vanished from his sight,

is also marked, by its being further added, "And he *saw him no more*" (Ver. 12). As then it is evident that Elisha beheld the whole transaction, not with the eyes of his body but with the eyes of his spirit, it follows, that it was the spirit only of Elijah, and not his body, which in that state he saw. Had he beheld the ascension of Elijah with his natural sight, as we behold an aeronaut ascend in a balloon, there could have been no room for the intimation, that it was by special divine favor that he was enabled to see the vision: but as there is such an intimation; as, likewise, it is certain that the chariot and horses of fire, could not, like a balloon, be beheld with the natural sight, it becomes certain that the person who was thus seen to ascend was a spiritual, not a material aeronaut,—was not the body of Elijah, but his spirit.

But it is asked, What then became of his body? Suppose we ask in return, If he soared through the air to heaven, considered, as this supposition requires, as a place beyond the region of the stars, what became of *the life* of his body? We know, from the experience of those who have climbed lofty mountains or ascended in balloons, that the air becomes so rare at the height of but a very few miles from the earth's surface as to make respiration difficult, and that, on continuing to ascend, an animated body would soon come into the state of an animal in an exhausted receiver, and must inevitably expire; and we know also, that the temperature at the same time becomes so cold, that the fluids of the body would speedily be arrested, and the animal frame become a solid mass of ice. If then it is not immediately evident what became of Elijah's body, it is sufficiently evident what became of the life of it; and if we still suppose that it went to heaven by this route, we must suppose that it accomplished the voyage, not as an animated body, but as a corpse. But does not the Sacred Record itself indicate what became of the body, when it informs us, that the immediate agent in Elijah's removal was a *whirlwind*, or, according to the more extensive signification of the original expression, *a violent storm*? We read in Ps. lxxxiii. 14, 15; "As the *fire* burneth the wood, and as *the flame setteth the mountains on fire*; so persecute them with thy tempest, and make them afraid with thy *storm*;" where the word in the original for *storm* is the same as is here rendered a *whirlwind*; and where an action is ascribed to it like that of fire and flame: Are we not then to infer, that it includes the action of lightning as well as of wind, the extreme of commotion or agitation (which is the radical idea of the word) in all the elements—all, in short, to which we usually apply the word *storm*? Place then any man in the very centre of such a commotion of the elements as we sometimes behold; thus expose him to the action of the

electric or galvanic fluid in its utmost energy ; —and any philosopher will inform us, not only that his body would be instantly deprived of its life, or that it would be torn to atoms,—for this would be the result of a comparatively slight action of that mighty solvent, — but that it would be completely decomposed and resolved into its elements. When therefore the Scripture informs us, (ver. 1), that “ the Lord would take up Elijah into heaven by a whirlwind or storm ;” and afterwards (ver 11) that he did so ; it tells us, by an euphuism, that Elijah died ; as Aaron and Moses, also by divine appointment, each went up into a mountain to die. (Num. xx. 25, &c. ; Deut. xxxii. 49, &c.) ; and it sufficiently explains why his body could not afterwards be found.

It appears then that the Sacred Record itself, when attended to, answers the question respecting what became of Elijah’s body. But were it otherwise : that his body was not transported into heaven would still be certain, not only from what has before been urged,—from the impossibility of the thing in itself, as being contrary to the order of the universe, which does not admit a grosser thing to enter into a purer,—and from the contrariety of the supposition to the explicit declarations, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption ; but also, from the authentic testimony we have of the state of Elijah in the other world. Moses, we know, certainly, was not translated, with his body into heaven ; for of him we read, that he was “ buried in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Beth-peor ” (Deut. xxxiv. 6). But when Jesus was transfigured, (before, as might easily be shown, the spiritual sight of his disciples), it is said, “ And behold, there talked with him two men, which were Moses and Elias ; who appeared in glory ” (Luke ix. 30, 31). Here, both are called men,—Moses, as well as Elias ; both, too, appeared in glory,—Elias as well as Moses ; then wherein did Moses differ from Elias ? Does not this relation prove, that the spirit is the man ; that the spirit has a spiritual body of its own ; that Moses had this, notwithstanding his natural body had been buried and had never been resuscitated ; and that Elias had no more, notwithstanding the Scripture does not so explicitly relate how he was divested of his natural body ? Here is clear proof that Moses without his natural body, was a man in glory and exactly in the same state as Elijah : how then can it be supposed that Elijah took into heaven with him, what, it is certain, Moses did not ? Thus, instead of proving the resurrection of the body, the history of Elijah completely disproves it, and demonstrates that man is a perfect man without it.

Having now examined such texts of the Old Testament as are usually cited in proof of the resurrection of the body, I will also take from Dr. Hody and briefly notice those texts of the

New Testament, commonly relied on by the advocates of that doctrine, which have not been considered.

Matt. v. 29, 30. "And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee : for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell. And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee : for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell." If 'the body' here literally means the body, of necessity the 'right eye' literally means the right eye, and the 'right hand' the right hand. But who ever dreamed that entrance to heaven could be facilitated by plucking out an eye or cutting off a hand ? And do they who gather from it, that all who go to hell go thither with their whole material body entire, gather from it also the inseparable counterpart of such a notion, — that many who go to heaven go thither one-eyed and maimed (for so the parallel passage, Mark ix. 43, 45, 47, gives it ; "It is better for thee to enter into life maimed, — halt, — and with one eye, than having two hands, — feet, — and eyes, to be cast into hell-fire") ? Every one sees that this part of the statement is not to be literally understood ; — how then can they run into such an inconsistency as to abide literally by the other ? Evidently, the offending eye and hand are mentioned to denote certain perverse propensities of the mind or spirit, from which alone all the organs of the body act : and as certain organs of the body are thus put for certain disorderly functions of the mind or spirit, which is the real man, to carry on the figure, and to avoid the incongruity of a mixed metaphor, the whole body is naturally, and according to the strict laws of composition, put for the whole mind or spirit, and thus for the whole man as he exists after death.

Matt. x. 28. "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul ; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." If there were no text which explained "how the dead are raised, and with what bodies they do come," it might perhaps, from this single text, be inferred, though it could not be proved, that the material body would be raised again : but when the nature of the resurrection-body is, as we shall see presently, so explicitly defined ; when we are so positively assured "that flesh and blood cannot enter into the kingdom of God," nor by consequence, into the eternal world at all, but, that "that which is raised is a spiritual body ;" there cannot be a doubt but that it is the spiritual body which is here intended. If it be objected, that this makes the body last mentioned, as liable to be destroyed in hell, different from the body first mentioned, as liable to be killed here : I answer ; that it is a universal rule of the logicians, often resorted to by

the commentators on Scripture, that every predicate is to be understood as to be in agreement with its subject : but to be killed on earth can only be predicated of the natural body ; so, to be destroyed in hell can only be predicated of the spiritual body. Thus it was common to the Lord to use the same word in different senses, though both properly belonging to it, in the same sentence ; as when he says, " He that loveth his life shall lose it ; and he that loses his life for my sake and the gospel's the same shall save it : " where, obviously, the life lost and the life saved are not the same life.

If it be still insisted that we must take the term body in the same sense in the last place as in the first, and understand that which is to be destroyed in hell to be the natural body : I answer ; that then we must here take the term *hell* to mean such a place as is fitted for the destroying of natural bodies. And this will compel us to take the original term here translated *hell* in its literal, and not in its figurative sense. The original term is *Gehenna*, which all the lexicographers and commentators tell us is the same in the Syriac language as *Gia-Hinnom* in the Hebrew, that is, *the valley of Hinnom* : which, having formerly been the place where the idolatrous Jews made their children " pass through the fire to Molech,"* was afterwards used as a receptacle for every thing filthy and abominable, into which the bodies of the worst of malefactors were cast, and consumed by the fires which were kept continually burning, to prevent infection from being generated by the impurities of the place. This idea being presented to every Jew by the use of the word *Gehenna*, Doddridge introduces both ideas into his paraphrase of the Lord's words, Matt. v. 22 — " shall be in danger of hell-fire ; " which he amplifies thus : " shall be obnoxious to the fire of hell, or to a future punishment more dreadful even than that of being burnt alive in the valley of Hinnom, from whence you borrow the name of those infernal regions."† If then it be contended that the body to be destroyed in *Gehenna* is the natural body, the *Gehenna* in which it is to be destroyed must be taken in its natural sense also ; it will then be merely the valley of Hinnom. They who will not acquiesce in this interpretation, must give up the notion that the passage relates to the material body. To combine the natural sense of body with the spiritual sense of the valley of Hinnom, is inconsistency indeed.

But if there is some difficulty respecting to the literal sense of this passage, there is none respecting to its spiritual sense ; which for its simplicity, beauty, and perfect consistency, I will here briefly state. The soul and the body, in the spiritual sense, are the internal and external man. The life of the external man,

* See 2 Kings xxiii. 10.

† See also his note.

by birth, is in opposition to the heavenly life, and consists in mere lusts or concupiscences; wherefore this life is to be relinquished or extinguished; which is effected by means of temptations. They who kill the body, then, are the temptations, and the tempting powers, by whose agency the life of the external man, or the life of man's lusts, is extinguished: and he who hath power to cast soul and body into hell, is the love of evil, which is opposition to the Lord pertinaciously cherished, and which causes the Lord himself to appear as in opposition to man; the consequence of which is the destruction both of the internal and the external man, and immersion in endless misery.

Matt. xxvii. 52, 53. When Jesus died on the cross, we read, "And the graves were opened; and many bodies of saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many." It has always appeared to me surprising that any should quote this narration in proof of the common doctrine of the resurrection of the body; when it is attended with such difficulties, if taken literally, as strongly lead to the opinion, that the bodies which arose were not natural or material bodies; and, by consequence, that there is no reference to the natural or material body, in any of the passages which treat of the resurrection.

In the first place, if the bodies of *all* who have lived from the creation of the world are to be raised together at a certain last day (as the texts on which the doctrine rests, if they teach any such doctrine at all, must be understood to affirm), is it not very extraordinary that "many" of these same bodies actually rose without waiting for this last day? The matter would be not quite so surprising were there to be two general resurrections, — one at the time of the Lord's resurrection, of all who had lived previously, and a final one of all who should live afterwards: but in the case before us the bodies of *all* who had previously lived did not rise, but only of *many* of them.

Is it not then, secondly, very extraordinary, if there was a resurrection of material bodies at all; that it should be merely a partial one? Upon what principle could the selection be made? How, with justice to the countless millions who were left slumbering still in their graves, to wait for their resurrection thousands of years afterwards, could a termination be thus put to the long sleep of some? And who could those be supposed to be who were thus favored? Mr. Fleming conjectures, and certainly with great plausibility, taking the premises for granted, that they were some of the most eminent saints of the Old Testament. Certainly, very superior eminence was necessary, to make the distinction not invidious. But, as others observe, no saint of the Old Testament was more eminent than David; it would therefore be very improbable that David should

be excluded from such a resurrection : and yet we learn, from Acts ii. 34, that David's body then remained still in its grave. The learned are obliged, therefore, to conclude, that these were not eminent, but merely common saints ; and some, to avoid other difficulties, suppose that they were such as had not been long dead, and whose bodies, as yet, were not much the worse for their sojourn in the tomb.

But, thirdly, is it not very extraordinary, that so public a miracle, as well as so stupendous a one, as this must have been, if the circumstances were literally as related, was never appealed to by the Apostles, either in their preaching, as recorded in the Acts, or in their Epistles ; and is never anywhere alluded to but in this single place ? When speaking of the resurrection of Jesus, how came they never to advert to the multitude who rose with him, and who had appeared to so many ? The graves were opened at the Lord's crucifixion ; their tenants came forth after his resurrection ; " consequently," in the words of Doddridge, " the tombs stood open all the sabbath, when the law would not allow any attempt to close them. What an astonishing spectacle ! especially if their resurrection was not instantaneously accomplished, but by such slow degrees as that represented in Ezekiel's vision." Astonishing indeed ! And how did the Jews evade the force of such a prodigy ? The sepulchre of Jesus was certainly found unclosed and empty ; wherefore the chief priests bribed the soldiers to say, that his disciples stole the body while they slept. But to what purpose was this fiction, if a multitude of other graves were also thrown open, and the bodies which tenanted them lay disclosed, subject to the inspection of the crowds who would eagerly watch the progress of their revivification, from Friday afternoon till Sunday morning, when they came forth and marched into the holy city ? How could this be concealed ? Was it pretended that the small band of disciples stole all these bodies likewise ? We do not find that any such fiction was in this case resorted to : and, indeed, in this case, no one could have believed it ; since these things were not done in a corner, but all that was passing in the graves was visible to every observer for more than thirty-six hours. How then did the Jews evade it ? We do not find that they had any occasion to try to evade it : for we do not find, from any other part of the gospel-records, that either the friends of Christianity, or its enemies, or a single inhabitant of this world, knew anything about the matter.

Fourthly, is it not very extraordinary, that this resurrection of dead bodies should take place, and yet there should be no intimation as to what became of them afterwards ? Did they, after having shown themselves, go and lie down again in their graves, to wait for the final " resurrection at the last day " ? This, as the pious Doddridge observes, ' one can hardly imagine.' Did they

then, like Lazarus and the others raised by the Lord while in the world, continue to live on earth, in due time to die again? This also, with Doddridge, "one can hardly imagine, because it is only said, they *appeared to them*." Most therefore, conclude, with the same writer, that "they ascended to heaven, with or after, our Lord;" for it would be impossible to suppose that they ascended before him. But what was done with them in the meantime? If they remained on earth for forty days, how could they escape observation? how is it that all Jerusalem was not in commotion on account of the presence of such extraordinary visitors? Dr. Doddridge supposes, that "they were directed to retire to some solitude during the intermediate days, and to wait in devout exercises for their change; for surely, as he justly observes, had they ascended in the view of others, the memory of such a fact could not have been lost." Indeed, the affair of their ascension was conducted with such secrecy, that it was not even witnessed by those who were admitted to witness the ascension of the Lord; and to make it a greater secret, Matthew himself does not inform us that it ever took place.

Now can any one suppose that a transaction which requires such improbable conjectures to make it possible, ever literally occurred at all? And whither could they ascend? What region was there in existence suited for the residence of resuscitated material bodies? They who contend for a general resurrection of material bodies, find it necessary to provide a material world for their abode. Thus Dr. Hody says, "Perhaps, after all, our heaven will be nothing but a heaven upon earth, or some glorious solid orb created on purpose for us in those immense regions which we *call* heaven. It seems more natural to suppose, that since we are to have solid and material bodies, we may be placed, as we are in this life, on some solid and material orb. — That, after the resurrection, we are to live for ever in a *new earth*, was, as Maximus tells us, the opinion of many in his time: and the same was asserted, in the third century, by St. Methodius, bishop of Tyre, in his treatise concerning the Resurrection." What then was to become of these resuscitated bodies of saints before this *new earth* was provided for them? for they who thus believe the Scriptures literally, when they speak of a new heaven [or sky] and a new earth, must believe them literally also when they say, that this new heaven and new earth are not to be produced till the former heaven and earth have passed away. Prior to that event then, at least, a resuscitated material body would be in the situation either of a fish in the air, or of a bird under water, it could find no element suited to its state.

Other difficulties, in regard to the literal acceptance of this narrative, present themselves as I write; but I forbear to proceed further. From what has been suggested, and from the

circumstance, that of these risen bodies the remarkable expression is used, that they *appeared unto many* the natural inference is, that they were not visible *to all*, as material bodies must have been, but only to those to whom *they appeared*, in other words, that they were seen in vision, not with the natural sight. Hence it will follow, that the bodies which thus appeared in vision were not natural but spiritual bodies, and that the whole transaction belongs more to the spiritual than to the natural world. I shall have occasion to advert to it again, in the Section on the Last Judgment; when I trust, its true nature will readily appear.

Phil. iii. 21. “Who shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself.” This text is so similar in substance to 1 Cor. xv. 49 and 53, to be considered in the sequel, that it scarcely needs a separate notice: only this passage, combined with its context, evinces (what might be well worthy of particular investigation), how much the idea of an inward and spiritual resurrection was associated with the subject in the Apostle’s mind. Thus, having said that he had suffered the loss of all things that he might win Christ, he adds, “That I might know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death, if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead: not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect; but I follow ‘after,’ &c. (Ver. 10, 11, 12). Here what could he mean by the ‘*power of the Lord’s resurrection*,’ but a power of conforming him into the image of his risen Lord? What by ‘*the fellowship of his sufferings*,’ but a submission to such states of affliction and trial as were necessary as means to this end? *What by being made conformable to his death*,’ but the complete mortification of the life of his own old or natural man? And what by *attaining to the resurrection of the dead*, which he evidently speaks of as something attainable in this life, — otherwise his modest notice, “not as though I had already attained,” would be nonsense; — what can he thus mean by attaining unto the resurrection of the dead, but a state of complete regeneration’ when all that previously was spiritually dead, — all that is the seat of man’s inborn corruptions — is quickened with spiritual life, and formed anew by the Lord? Thus his whole argument is consistent: whereas to make him talk of striving to attain unto the resurrection of the dead, meaning by the resurrection of the dead the resurrection of dead bodies, which all (if any) are to experience whether they strive for it or not, and which, strive as they will, they cannot bring on any sooner; is to make him talk in a strange manner indeed. And as, as will be shown in the last Part of this Section, in our remarks on 2 Cor. v. 1 — 4, he always viewed this spiritual resurrection in connection with the

formation of the heavenly spiritual body within our outward frame, first to come into open manifestation when the latter is put off, which is thus exchanged for it, and, as far as the person's own perceptions are concerned, appears as if it were changed into it; and as, as might be easily shown he seldom uses the term *body* or *flesh* in reference to the body of clay alone, but means by it all that belongs to what is called in theology the external or natural man; (as when he says, "I know that in me, that is, in my *flesh*, dwelleth no good thing;" "I delight in the law of God, after the inward man, but I see another law in my *members* warring against the law of my mind;" "Who shall deliver me from *the body* of this death?" "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be the spirit of Christ be in you;" "And if Christ be in you, *the body* is dead, because of sin;" "He that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your *mortal bodies*, by his spirit that dwelleth in you," &c.)—having, I say, these ideas in his mind, he at present closes the subject with saying, that "the Lord Jesus Christ shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body: according to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself," meaning, that we shall have a spiritual body, the image of the Lord's Divine Body; and which is even now being so fashioned within us by the regenerating energy of the Lord.

2 Tim. ii. 17, 18. "Of whom is Hymeneus and Philetus; who concerning the truth have erred, saying, That the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some." This text has been quoted against us, from 'good old John Bunyan,' in this form: "Have you not heard of them that were made to err, by hearkening to Hymeneus and Philetus, as concerning the faith of the *resurrection of the body*." It seems to be meant to be insinuated, by this false quotation, that we have adopted the opinion of those primitive heretics. How convenient the advocates of error find it, continually to be speaking, as here, of the *resurrection of the body*, as if such were the language of Scripture; when, in Scripture, no such language is anywhere to be found. As to the error of Hymeneus and Philetus, the Apostle states that it consisted in saying, "that the resurrection is past already." Whatever idea then they attached to the term *resurrection*, it evidently was totally different from ours. When the Apostle affirms that they believed the resurrection to be then past, he must mean, that they disbelieved any resurrection which was then future, and consequently denied any future life: whereas, according to our idea of it the resurrection is never past, but always future, at every instant of time, to all the inhabitants of the globe, all of whom will experience a resurrection to life without end.

Rev. xx. 13. "And the sea gave up the dead that were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged every man according to their works."

Nothing is here said about dead bodies: and that the whole transaction is not to be literally understood, is plain from the evidently symbolic language in which it is couched. Why is the sea said to give up the dead which are in it, which comparatively are few while no notice is taken of the dead which are in the earth? What is meant by death and hell delivering up the dead which are in them? What kind of dead they are which are *in death*, does not appear; but certainly they which are already *in hell* are not dead bodies. And what is meant when it is said in the next verse, "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire?" Are death and hell persons, or places? Or is Death a person, and hell a place? But the previous verse seems to speak of them both as places; and how death and hell as places, could be cast in the lake of fire, it is very difficult to conceive. Certainly, nothing like a plausible interpretation of the passage can be given by those, who quote it as evidence for the resurrection of the body. The whole belongs to the subject of the Last Judgment; wherefore I will reserve our explanation of it till the next Section.

We have now passed under review all the texts which, as far as I am aware, are usually cited by the advocates of the resurrection of the body in proof of that doctrine; and it has, I trust, abundantly appeared, that none of them prove any such thing.

As, however, the Scriptures so totally refuse to afford evidence for the resurrection of the body, an opponent judiciously ekes out their testimony by that of a prophet who pretended to correct them. "The Swedenborgians," says he, "will esteem it no very high compliment to be told, that the Mahometans are in more respects than one more orthodox than themselves. I have this moment a book before me entitled, '*Mahometanism fully explained*,' and from the sixth article of their faith, which is on the *Future Resurrection* I make the following extract:—'We are obliged cordially to believe, and to hold for certain, that the first before all others, whom God shall revive in heaven, shall be the Angel of Death, and that he will at that time re-call all the souls in general, and re-unite them to the respective bodies to which each belonged: some of which shall be destined to glory, and others to torment. But upon earth the first whom God shall raise, shall be our blessed prophet Mahomet,' " &c. Here, certainly, the doctrine is advanced explicitly enough, and with some very suitable adjuncts; but our opponents are heartily welcome to all the support they can derive from such authority, which we trust will have its *due* influence on the reader. "The Swedenborgians," we assure them, esteem it no ill compliment, that they are fain to intrench themselves against them in the orthodoxy of Mahometans. From the terms themselves,—*resurrection*,—*to rise again*,—it is sometimes contended, that

that which is to rise is something that has lived *before*, but the life of which has been interrupted, whence it rises or lives *again* : and this, it is affirmed, is only predicable of the body ; whereas the spirit, as it never ceases to live, though it may be said at death to rise, cannot be said to rise *again*. But this is, in every respect, a very shallow criticism : it affords an argument only for the ignorant, and which no man of information can seriously urge. This will be fully shown in the last Part of this Section. At present I will only observe, that even supposing the proper idea of the original words to be, *to rise again* ; it would not follow that he who rises again enters a second time into his material body, and so rises again, any more than that he who is born again enters a second time into his mother's womb, and so is born again. If to be *born again* (and, in the original, *again* is *here* expressed by a separate adverb), is to enter a new state in which the man has never been before, to *rise again* must also be, to enter into a new state in which the man has never been before. The particle *again*, then, does not, in this use, imply a returning back to the same state as has been previously experienced, but an advancing forward to a new state, bearing a certain analogy to one which has been previously experienced ; and we cannot suppose that the resurrection is a repetition of bodily life, without concluding, with Nicodemus, that regeneration is a repetition of bodily birth. How much is it to be lamented, that Nicodemus should have so many disciples ; that many should be so prone, like him, to turn their minds from spirit to matter, and to carnalize the instructions of the Lord Jesus Christ ! For certainly, if it may be said without offence, the idea that, in order to our rising again, we are to return again to the body of flesh, is the exact counterpart of the notion, that, in order to our being born again, we are to return again to the mother's womb. The one is just as good an interpretation of the Lord's instructions as the other. Our existence as embryos in the womb is necessary to prepare us for birth into the world, and birth into the world is necessary to prepare us for birth into eternity : and to suppose that the spirit, after having dwelt for ages in its own world, is to return again to the body which it left in this, is just as consonant with the Lord's instructions, as it would be to suppose, that the man is to be reinvested with the integuments of the foetus and to return to his mother's womb, not even for the purpose of being born again, but of living the life of a foetus forever.

With this general remark, I close the examination of the texts and arguments commonly adduced from Scripture in proof of the resurrection of the body. I have gone into them thus fully, because I have observed, that, on this subject, the most convincing evidence of the truth often fails to make its due impression, while the mind reverts to the texts and arguments

which it has been accustomed to regard as establishing the contrary doctrine, and while it is not furnished with a solution of the opposing confirmations which it has thus imbibed. A sufficient solution has now, I trust, been offered ; and that, by the blessing of Him who is the resurrection and the life, it will be seen that there is not a single text of Scripture, or argument that can be drawn from that source, which affords any real countenance to the doctrine of the resurrection of the material body.

SECTION III.

THE RESURRECTION.

PART III.

The Testimony of Reason, for, and against, the Resurrection of the Material Body.

We have now examined most of the texts of Scripture generally referred to as supporting the notion of the resurrection of the body ; and have ascertained that, in reality, they afford that doctrine no countenance whatever. But the evidence of Reason, also, is here peculiarly worthy of being considered : for this subject includes particulars, the decision of which falls within the province of Reason : and we may be certain that the *genuine* decisions of Reason can never be at variance with the genuine meaning of Scripture. Before, then, we proceed to the testimony of Scripture in behalf of man's immediate resurrection, and his non-resumption of the material body, I will show both by original remarks, and the testimony of distinguished writers, that the arguments commonly urged, as from Reason, in favor of the Resurrection of the material body, are destitute of all solidity, and that in fact, such a resurrection is nothing short of impossible.

In favor of the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body, only two general arguments, wearing any air of speciousness, have been urged from Reason. These then we will first briefly consider ; after which we will inquire what Reason has to say on the other side of the question.

The two arguments to which I allude have constantly been brought forward from the first beginning of the controversies on this subject : but I have no where seen them stated with more subtilty, by mixing fallacies with acknowledged truths so ingeniously, that an inattentive reader might not see how to disentangle them, and thus might accept the one for the sake of the other, than is done by Dr. O. Gregory, in his elegant and popular "Letters on the Evidences, Doctrines, and Duties of the Christian Religion." We will consider them, therefore, as they are offered by this writer.

He opens his chapter on the subject in this imposing manner :

“If a being, which was constituted by the union of two substances essentially different, were appointed to continue, it must continue a *mixed* being, or it would be no longer the *same* being ; so that if man is to exist in a future state, the doctrine of the resurrection of the body is a necessary consequence of his nature : those who admit the immortality of the soul and deny the resurrection of the body, therefore, forget the *man*, and, in effect, deprive him of existence beyond the grave.”—The fallacy here lies in the premises, — “if a being which was constituted by the union of two substances essentially different *were appointed to continue ;*” — that is, the author means, *were appointed to continue a being constituted of two substances ;* but this is the very point in dispute, and is gratuitously assumed by Dr. G., without any proof of it being attempted. Were it true, it would involve the continuance of our existence forever *here* ; for what sort of *continuing* is that, which, after having been broken off, as, in the case of our first parents, (according to the common supposition), for many thousands of years, is, after the lapse of, probably many thousands of years more, to begin again ? Its truth then may be unhesitatingly denied ; and there is an end of the inference built upon it. Besides, if all the substances with which the man has been at any time united were intended to form a part of him forever, the coverings within which his body advanced to its complete formation in the embryo-state must be raised again also. Not only, in that state, is the infant inclosed in the coats called the *amnion* and *corion*, but it is vitally united to the compages of vessels called the *placenta* ; but as, when the infant is born into the world, these extrinsic appendages, in which the embryo had been nurtured to a sufficient degree of maturity, are cast away as refuse, so, when the man is born into eternity, the body in which his spirit had been nurtured to a sufficient degree of maturity, is also cast away as refuse : the one, *then*, forms a part of the real man, no more than does the other ; and it is no more reasonable to expect the resurrection of the one than of the other. It is a mere play upon a word then to say, that without the continuance of the union of the soul and body, future existence is denied to the *man*. This may also be illustrated by a still more familiar example. In a walnut, the kernel and the shell begin their existence together ; but it evidently is solely for the sake of the kernel, — in order that the kernel may be developed and formed, — that the shell is produced at all : and after the kernel is formed, were it to continue forever in union with its shell, the end of its creation would be frustrated. Hence, who denies the kernel of the walnut to be the essential *walnut* ? While it remains in the shell, we indeed apply the term to the whole ; that is, we admit the shell to a slight (and but a slight)

share of the honor that belongs to its contents : but when they are separated, while we never think of giving the name of a walnut to the empty shell, we never hesitate at applying it to the kernel : the kernel, only, is the *walnut* now, as it was *the essential walnut* always. All this answers, by a most exact analogy to the ~~case of~~ man, his body and his soul ; and demonstrates how mere a quibble it is to affirm, that if the soul and body do not continue in union, there is an end of *the man*.

By the other argument alluded to, it is endeavored to interest the Divine Justice in the resurrection of the body. Dr. Gregory states it thus : " God is a wise and just governor of the world : such a governor must reward the good and punish the wicked : but, in the present state, we often see good men under suffering, and bad men following and enjoying pleasure, through the greater part of life ; the character of the governor therefore requires that there should be a future state, in which this great anomaly shall be adjusted ; [so far the argument is solid ; and the whole of the conclusion which the premises sanction is already brought out ; but here comes the deceptive appendage, built upon the fallacy which we have already exposed] " and of course, a state of existence not for the body alone, nor for the soul alone, but for the man in his mixed nature, constituted of soul and body. It is the man, and not a part of him merely, which this simple train of reasoning requires us to expect shall be rewarded and punished." The futility of this reasoning, however, even the author himself acknowledges in a note : " I am aware," says he, " it may be said, and indeed it has often been said, that since consciousness and feeling exist in the soul, the future existence of the *soul* is all that can fairly be inferred from this argument. But," he adds " we have at least as good reasons for affirming as any can have for denying, that in all probability the capacity of the soul for feeling the highest degree of pleasure or pain depends upon its union with an organized body." So then his grand argument is allowed to be good for nothing, if the soul without the body can be proved to have sensations of pain or pleasure sufficiently acute : to which an ample answer is given in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus.

But this argument is allowed to be invalid by many even of the advocates for the resurrection of the body. I might quote the decided opinion to this effect of Dr. Watts ; but I will be content with the ingenuous and solid observations of the learned Hody. After citing the statement of this argument by several of the fathers, as they are called, he says, (in his work, " The Resurrection of the Same Body Asserted," &c). " I desire as much as any man to pay a just deference and regard to the

judgment of the ancient fathers ; but it must be confessed, that though their authority be great in matters of tradition, yet the reasons and arguments which they produce to confirm their doctrines are not always convincing. If we seriously and impartially consider this assertion, [that God is obliged in justice to reward or punish the body together with the soul,] we shall find it not to be true. My reasons briefly are these. First : To speak properly, the body is not capable either of sinning or doing well. It is only the instrument of the soul ; and *the arm* that stabs, *sins* no more than *the sword* ; 'tis *the soul* only that is *the murderer*. Neither, secondly, is the body capable of any reward or punishment. 'Tis *the soul* only that is *sensible* ; and nothing but what is sensible can be capable of rewards and punishments. Thirdly : If it be injustice in God to punish the soul alone without the body in conjunction with which she committed the sin, then all the matter which constituted the body when the several sins were committed, must be raised again, and be re-united to the soul. For if *some*, why not *all* ? But what monsters of men should we be in the resurrection, if all the substance of which our bodies consisted, from our childhood to our death, should be gathered together and formed into a body !" — To these three reasons of this honest writer's can anything bearing the semblance of a reason be opposed ?

Dr. Gregory, however, considers it to be so necessary, to vindicate the Divine Justice, that the body should be rewarded or punished as well as the soul, that he affirms, " that the conclusion cannot be fairly resisted, unless it can be shown, that the resurrection of the body is impossible." Though we have already seen that his reasoning is destitute of all validity, independently of such impossibility, yet probably it may not be difficult to comply even with this unreasonable demand.

But perhaps it may be necessary first to state in what sense I affirm the resurrection of the material body to be impossible : I mean, that it is as impossible as anything whatever that can be conceived. If we were to pronounce it to be absolutely impossible, its advocates, I know, would eagerly exclaim, that we deny the omnipotence of God. Little honor, to be sure, is done to God, when his omnipotence is supposed to be employed in effecting things trifling, unnecessary, or ridiculous : but without saying, absolutely, that God *cannot* do it ; from what we see of the nature of his divine works, and of the manner in which he produces them, we may with certainty conclude that he *will not* : and what God *will not* do, or *wills not* to do, is to all practical purposes, impossible.

It is utterly foreign to the argument to appeal, as is done by Dr. G., to the cases of the restoration of life to the bodies of

certain dead persons recorded in the Scriptures ; for in those instances the bodies had not undergone even the commencement of decomposition, nor had the spirit been entirely extricated from them : even in the case of Lazarus, who had been dead four days, there can be no doubt, notwithstanding the conclusion of his sister, that the natural tendency to corruption had been miraculously suspended by that Divine Hand, whose purpose from the beginning had been to restore him to life. Besides, all these were restored, not to an immortal, but only to a lengthened period of mortal life, and, after a while, they all died again.

Not at all more to the purpose are the examples which Dr. G. relates of the transformations undergone by insects, and the growth from seed of the vegetable creation. Many of these illustrate, by beautiful analogies, the emerging at death of man's spiritual form from the shell of clay ; but in no respect whatever do they answer to the fancied revival of the material body. For instance : respecting the *Libellula*, or dragon-fly, he relates this pretty history. "Naturalists tell us, that the worm repairs to the margin of its pond in quest of a convenient place of abode during its insensible state. It attaches itself to a plant or piece of dry wood ; and the skin, which gradually becomes parched and brittle, at last splits opposite to the upper part of the thorax. Through this aperture the insect, now become winged, quickly pushes its way, and being thus extricated from confinement, begins to expand its wings, to flutter, and finally to launch into the air with that gracefulness and ease which are peculiar to this majestic tribe. Now who, that saw for the first time the *little pendant coffin* in which the inanimate insect lay entombed, and was ignorant of the transformations of which we are speaking, would ever predict that in a few weeks, perhaps in a few hours, it would become one of the most elegant and active of *winged* insects ?" To this he adds : "And who that contemplates with the mind of a philosopher this curious transformation, and who knows that two years before the insect mounts into the air, even while it is living in the water, it has the rudiments of *wings*, can deny that the body of a dead man may at some future period be again invested with vigor and activity, and soar to regions for which some latent organization may peculiarly fit it ?" Is this indeed the conclusion which he "that contemplates" the phenomenon "with the mind of a philosopher" should draw ? Should not such a mind perceive, that "*the body of a dead man*" answers in reality to "*the little pendant coffin*" of the insect, not to the *winged creature that springs from it* ? Liken the *body* itself to the *winged creature*, and where do you find "*the little pen-*

dant coffin?" The "coffin" of the insect does not answer to the coffin in which man's earthly remains are deposited in the dust, since this never formed, as in the case of the insect, any part of him. But admit that there is indeed a spiritual organization." — a spiritual body, "latent" within the body of matter, and which is "extricated from confinement" in it at death, when it "soars to the regions for which a *spiritual* organization peculiarly fits it;" and you have, in all its parts, the analogy complete. Such analogies then in no degree tend to prove that the resurrection of the body is not impossible: they only tend to prove that man may have, within his material body, a "latent organization," which, if "latent," that is, undiscoverable to the senses, must be a spiritual one, which may emerge from the "coffin" it once animated, and live when this lies mouldering in the dust.

But the argument most relied on for proving the possibility of the resurrection of the body, is, that it could not require a greater exertion of Omnipotence to restore life to the dead bodies of all mankind, than it required to create them at first; wherefore, it is asked, As God did the one, why should not he do the other? To this it may be answered, That whether, or not, the raising again of all dead bodies to life require a greater exertion of Omnipotence than their original creation, of this we are certain, that the one work is within, and according to, the laws of nature, or the laws of order, which every thing demonstrates that God has laid down for the conduct of his own operations; whereas the other is without, and entirely contrary to, those laws. We know that all the divine works proceed from an imperceptible beginning to their fulness and maturity, by successive steps, through the most beautiful progression, regulated by a most certain and most admirable order; and that this progression and order are particularly conspicuous in the formation of the human body. We know that, for the formation of a human body, a crude mass of the materials furnished by the lower parts of nature is not at once brought together and then suddenly informed with the human soul, as Prometheus is feigned to have modelled into human shape a mass of clay, and then to have quickened it with fire brought down from heaven; but that the soul, or the rudiments of the soul or spiritual form, being from the beginning present, and being, doubtless, the immediate agent in procuring for itself a body, the latter commences from the most delicate and highly refined materials which nature can furnish, which are arranged in an organized form from the beginning. We know that the rudiments of the brain are produced first, that being the primary organ in and by which the soul descends into the body;

then the rudiments of the heart ; and that from these two then proceeds the whole system of the nerves and of the arteries and veins, by the medium of which the other viscera of the body are successively formed, and afterwards are enclosed within the muscular and bony frame constituting the cavities of the cranium, the thorax, and the abdomen ; whilst the limbs and exterior members are also gradually formed, and finally the whole is enclosed in the integument of the skin. We know, also, what wonderful care is exercised by the Creator for the safety of the embryo-man ; all these wonderful works taking place, not in a cold sepulchre of uncongenial earth, but within the living body of its parent : and, what perhaps is still more striking, and makes a more impassable difference between the mode of the formation of the human body at first and that of its expected resurrection from the grave, we know that not a single atom of the materials from which the soul forms to itself a body, is taken in its crude state from inanimate nature, or is transferred into the human body in the same state as when it previously existed in the inanimate parts of nature, but that every particle is first elaborated into a proper state for the purpose, by the most wonderful of all chemical agents, a previously living human body, and is not presented to the infant soul to be by it adopted into the composition of its body, till it has been refined to the proper degree by that living alembic, the body of its parent. And when, by these truly wonderful means, throughout the whole of which shines so conspicuous the infinite Wisdom of the Creator as well as his infinite Power, the incipient human body is brought to such a degree of maturity as to be able to exist in a state of separation from its mother, its further growth, and the continued preservation of its existence, are still provided for in a similar manner. No addition is ever made to its substance by the accession of matter taken immediately and crudely from outward nature ; but the substances of nature capable of contributing to this purpose, are elaborated into the proper state by the wonderful chemistry exercised upon them by the digestive organs and minute absorbents : thus, in no instance whatever, is a single particle of dead matter united to a living body, without having its intractability and incapacity for the reception of animal life first overcome by the action upon it of a living digester, — by that amazing chemistry which no art can imitate, and which nature herself cannot exercise in any other laboratory than that of a living body. It is thus that the bodies of the whole mass of mankind, except the first created pair, have been formed and nourished ; and who can suppose, that, in regard even to these, the order was essentially different ? Can any seriously be-

lieve that Adam was, in fact, a mere Promethean image,—a mass of potter's clay, afterwards endued with a soul? Who can doubt that the creative energy, when, having completed the world through all its lower kingdoms, it bade nature teem with man, produced, either by the medium of the vegetable kingdom or otherwise, some tender envelope,—some artificial matrix,—within which the human form might first begin to expand, and which might perform for it the functions of the maternal parent? Who can doubt, that however the first rudimental form of the first man was produced, he was nourished to his full stature, as his descendants have been ever since,—by aliments incorporated, by the same process, into his frame?

Now is it any derogation from the Omnipotence of the Adorable Creator to say, that matter cannot be compacted into a human body by any other process, than that which we see the Creator himself has provided, and always employs, for the purpose? Are not the laws by which all the changes of matter are governed, the laws of the Creator himself? When he created matter, did he not also assign to it its proper nature? May we not then be certain, that in all his operations upon matter,—in all the use which he makes of it in taking from it the materials for the higher species of his omnipotent works,—he will regard the nature which he himself has given to matter, and follow the laws which he himself has appointed for the transmutation of dead matter into living and human substance? Is it possible to change that nature and to reverse those laws, without abolishing matter, as actually existing, altogether, and producing a new species of matter, possessing a quite different nature, and subject to quite different laws? May we not then affirm decidedly, that the resurrection of the body, composed as the body is of the matter actually now existing, and with the general laws for the transmutation of which into living substance we are in some measure acquainted, is an absolute impossibility? Really, it appears, that there is no conclusion within the powers of reason to arrive at more certain than this. And thus, to affirm that the resurrection of the body is impossible, no more includes a negation of the Divine Omnipotence, than to affirm that it is impossible for the same thing to be and not to be at the same time. On the other hand, they who maintain such resurrection to be possible, in reality affirm it to be possible for the same thing to be and not to be at the same time: for we see that matter must both continue to be matter, and cease to be matter, to admit of the resurrection of the material body. God is omnipotent, because, whatever he sees fit to be done, he can, by his Infinite Wisdom, contrive the means proper for doing it. In creation, we are enabled to

trace, in innumerable instances, some of the means which he employs to arrive at his ends; and we never discover any of them without being filled with admiration at the wondrous wisdom which they display; but how misplaced is this admiration if it be true, that the same ends might be attained in a more summary manner, without the employment of any means whatever! This is supposed by those who affirm, that, though it is by the use of such wonderful means, developed in such gradual progression, that the human body is formed at first, yet, after the particles which composed it have again degenerated into crude matter and have been undistinguishably mixed with the earth and the other elements of nature, they can again be collected together in a moment, and compaginated into the same body as before; and this without any action upon them of the soul, which was continually present in the formation of the body at first, but which can have no agency in its resurrection, unless we suppose a particle of it to remain attached to every particle of the dust and gasses into which the body is resolved. Surely, if this be exalting the Divine Omnipotence, it is libelling the Divine Wisdom: and there certainly is no presumption in affirming, that a measure which reverses the plans of Infinite Wisdom, cannot be included in the operations of Infinite Power.

If, then, there does appear such solid reason for concluding the resurrection of the body to be impossible, there surely is no impropriety in pointing out the absurdities which it involves, and by which its impossibility becomes more obvious. Accordingly, this has been done, not only by Swedenborg, but by many other wise and good men, and cordial believers in the word of God. In that Author's illustration of the proposition, "That the Coming of the Lord is not a Coming to destroy the visible heaven and the habitable earth, and to create a new heaven and a new earth, according to the opinion which many, from not understanding the spiritual sense of the Word, have hitherto entertained," he has occasion to mention the common opinions respecting the resurrection; in the course of which he makes some striking observations, on which it has been sneeringly said, that they "showed that the Baron, with all his faith and charity, could almost copy the language of Infidels." Now the observations thus stigmatized are precisely the same, in substance, as those which are more fully drawn out by the celebrated Dr. T. Burnet, in his work "On the State of the Dead," &c.* part of which, for the clearness with which they exhibit the deductions of genuine reason on the subject, I will here translate from the Latin original.

Speaking on the question, "Whether we are to rise with the

* *De Statu Mortuorum, &c.*

same bodies we lie down with in the grave," Dr. Burnet says, "It is not of any great consequence to any of us, whether we shall have the same particles, or others of equal dignity and value, or what shall become of our cast-off carcasses, when we shall live in light with angels:" and he quotes this passage of Seneca: "But as we neglect the hairs cut off from our beards, so, when the divine spirit goes out from a man, what becomes of its former receptacle, — whether fire shall burn it, or beasts tear it in pieces, or the earth cover it, — is of no more concern to him, than is the fate of the secundines or after-birth to a new-born child."

He afterwards asks, What are the consequences of taking the texts of Scripture, which seem to speak of the resurrection of the body, in the common sense? which he answers thus: "Let us see what inconsistencies, conveniences, and inconveniences, this opinion of the identity of the terrestrial and celestial body carries with it. We have before observed, that our body in this life is various, under a continual state of renovation and decay, and that, after some years, it passes through an entire change: therefore, in the course of human life, we may have six or seven different bodies, or more. This brings to my mind the question, impertinently enough urged by the Sadducees, concerning the woman who had seven husbands; whom she should have at the resurrection. Let us put the soul for the woman: Having had seven bodies, married partners, in a manner to that soul, which shall it have at the resurrection? for it had all. Perhaps you will say, The last. But it was possible the soul was more wicked, or more good, in the first body, than in the last; and therefore the first ought to be taken in as a partner in the glory or misery. Moreover: an old and battered body, or a young and infantile one, are no ornaments to a heavenly court; and of these the greatest part of departed human nature consists. But if you would raise infants to adult age, and bring back the body worn out by age to juvenility; here are so many additions and interpolations, that like the ship Argo a hundred times repaired, it has only the name, and none of the particles, of the original vessel. For my part, I had rather have a new *house from heaven*, than the old patched-up one, mended and botched in this manner.

"We shall consider next," he says again, "in what manner the scattered particles of dust are to be brought together again. The ashes are carried into distant parts over the earth and seas, and from thence into the region of the air, raised by the solar heat, and scattered into a thousand places of the heavens. Moreover: they are not only sowed and dispersed through all the elements, but they are inserted in the bodies of animals,

trees, fossils, and other things; and by their transmigrations through different bodies, they assume new natures, and qualities, new shapes and figures. These things being granted we may ask, In what manner this re-collection, from infinite distances, of latent parts and particles, is made? Nature is too weak to perform all this: and *the Divine Power must never be called forth except on just and necessary occasions*: As then it is perfectly unnecessary that we should have the same numerical parts in the immortal body, as we had in the mortal one, we must not call in the Divine power for its performance. To take great pains to accomplish trifling objects, is folly in man; and in God it is not to be thought of. To re-collect the particles of all the human carcasses deceased from the beginning of the world to the end; to separate this mass and parcel it out into little heaps; and then to re-form these and reduce them to their ancient figures; would be an operose miracle indeed: and the performance of this multifarious miracle would be as unnecessary, as anything like it is unexampled. But it is impossible, also. For the same piece of matter cannot be in two places at the same time. They say that some nations are *Anthropophagi*, — eaters of men: and it is impossible for the same individual flesh to belong to two bodies. But why do I speak of a few nations? We are all *Allelophagi*, — eaters of each other: for, if not immediately, yet after the lapse of some time, we all devour our progenitors. Their flesh having first passed into the substance of herbs and animals, some parts of it must at length pass into ours. If indeed the ashes of the dead, from the beginning of the world, had been preserved in imperishable urns and coffins; or rather, had they all been embalmed like mummies; we might hope to prevent this confounding of bodies: but as most carcasses are dissolved and dissipated, some of their substance returns to its mother earth, and the rest is exhaled into the air, and falling down in the dew and rain, is imbibed by the roots of plants, and forms the nourishment of grass, corn, and fruits; and thence it circulates back into the bodies of another generation. According to the poet:

“Jam seges est ubi Troja fuit, resecandaque falce,
Luxuriat Phrygio sanguine pinguis humus.”*

By this revolution the same particle of matter may have suffered several *metensomatoses*, and have gone through more bodies than the soul of Pythagoras. This being the case, how can every body have its own share of the common matter at the resurrection? If the first possessor has his due, the later will come short: and if the last keeps his right, what will become of

* “Rich harvests wave where mighty Troy once stood,
Birth of a soil made fat with Phrygian blood.”

the pretensions of the first? Thus if the first posterity of Adam take their material frames complete, and their successors only as much of them as had not been previously occupied, what imperfect bodies will be left for the last generation!"

At length, this learned writer thus concludes: "From what has been said, it appears that it is unnecessary, troublesome, if not impossible, for us to have the same bodies in this life and in a future state, after we have weighed all the consequences of this identity." And this, I apprehend, will be found to be the conclusion of genuine reason, — of reason illuminated at once by the light of science and by that of revelation.

Now, will they who affirm, that Swedenborg, when proving the groundlessness of the doctrine of the resurrection of the same or material body, "almost copies the language of infidels," say the same of this pious writer, and the many others whose sincere religious feeling and sound judgment were never questioned, who have exposed its absurdities in not less powerful language? They who defend it often seem conscious, that, upon any principle of true reason the doctrine is wholly indefensible: whence they would fain set a brand upon reason, as something exclusively belonging to unbelievers. The truth is, it is impossible even for scoffers and unbelievers to make the doctrine appear more ridiculous than is often done by those who mean to recommend it. For instance: Is not Dr. Burnet's exposure, just recited, of the inconveniences of the resurrection of the body, which he gives as reasons for regarding it as incredible, more than paralleled in the following intended eulogy upon it, in Dr. Young's celebrated poem of "The Last Day;" in which, in most harmonious numbers, he only and most gravely aims at extolling its wonders?

"Now monuments prove faithful to their trust,
And render back their long committed dust;
Now charnels rattle; scattered limbs, and all
The various bones, obsequious to the call,
Self-moved, advance; the neck, perhaps, to meet
the distant head; the distant legs, the feet.
Dreadful to view, see through the dusky sky
Fragments of bodies in confusion fly,
To distant regions journeying, there to claim
Deserted members, and complete the frame."

Again, speaking of Pompey, whose head was carried to Cæsar, the poet says,

"This sever'd head and trunk shall join once more,
Tho' realms now rise between, and oceans roar."

Again:

"The trumpet's sound each *fragrant* (!) mote shall hear,
Or fixt in earth, or if afloat in air,

Obey the signal wafted in the wind,
And not one sleeping atom lag behind."

Again :

"No spot on earth but has supplied a grave,
And human skulls the spacious ocean pave.
All's full of *man* ; (!) and at this dreadful turn,
The swarm shall issue, and the hive shall burn."

If the body is to rise again, all this is sober fact. But how monstrous does the scene appear, when thus faithfully depicted. Had the description been intended for burlesque, how could its ridicule have been made more poignant ?

Indeed so irreconcilable to reason appears the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, that many of the advocates for it in sober prose, have thence been driven to make such concessions to their opponents, as amount to an acknowledgment of the utter untenableness of the notion. Take, for example, the following statements of the truly respectable Dr. Watts :

"It is granted," says he, "*that it cannot be the very same body, in all the particles or atoms of it which were united to the soul in this world,* that shall be raised and united to it in the resurrection. (1.) Because all the atoms that ever belonged to the animal body of Methuselah in nine hundred and sixty-nine years, would make a most bulky and disproportionate figure at the resurrection. And, for the same reason, all the Antediluvians, who lived so many hundred years, would be raised as giants in comparison of us in later days. And on the same account also, every man, at the resurrection, would be so much larger than his contemporaries and neighbors, as he lived longer on earth : which is a vain and groundless conceit. (2.) All the same particles, even, of the body when it died and was buried, can hardly be raised again and united to the soul of any man ; because several of the particles that made one man's body at the time of his death are very probably turned to grass or plants, and so become food for cattle, or other men, and are become part of the bodies of other men several times over. And thus there might be great confusion, because the self-same particles would belong to the bodies of different men. Besides, here is one pious man perhaps died of a dropsy, or excessive fat and unwieldly ; must he be raised in that unwieldly bulk and those extravagant dimensions ? Another was worn out to a mere skeleton by consumption ; must his body be of this slender and withered shape or size ? Others, it may be, from their very birth, were in some part defective, or redundant ; and in these cases must not some particles be left out, or added, in the resurrection to form a proper body for the glori-

fied soul? All these considerations prove, that all the precise number of atoms that ever made up a man's body here on earth, or even those that belonged to it at the hour of death, are not necessary to be summoned together to form the same man at the resurrection."*

This is unquestionably true: but do not these considerations prove, further, that there can be no resurrection of the material body at all? How does this estimable writer, who so clearly saw, and so honestly states, these difficulties, endeavor to surmount them? By resorting to the gratuitous supposition, that there are "some original, essential, and constituent tubes, fibres, or staminal particles, which remain the same and unchanged through all the stages and changes of life, and are of such a nature as not to join and unite with other animal or human bodies;" and that these will be "raised in the formation of the new body, and be united to the same soul." But what mere begging the question, against all evidence and all reason, is this! It is exactly on a par with the fiction of the rabbins, that there is in the back of every Israelite an indestructible bone called *luz*, and in whatever part of the world a Jew may be buried, this aforesaid bone makes its way through the bowels of the earth, and will at last emerge, and expand into the perfect Jew again, in the land of Canaan. Which rabbinical doctrine, by the way, extravagant as it is, is yet less inconsistent than the common notion of Christians; for if the Jew is to have a material body again, it is that he may live again in the material world; not, as the Christian expects, to soar in it to heaven.

Archbishop Tillotson, however evades the difficulty arising from the fact, that the same particles of matter may pass into different bodies, in a quite contrary manner. Instead of supposing that there are certain staminal particles which will not pass into other bodies, he maintains, that if the whole of the matter composing a man's body at any one time were to pass into other bodies, there still would be plenty of materials rightfully belonging to him, out of which a good and proper body might be manufactured for him at the resurrection. He reasons thus:—

"1. The body of man is not a constant and permanent thing, always continuing in the same state, and consisting of the same matter; but a successive thing, which is continually spending and continually renewing itself, every day losing some of the matter which it had before and gaining new; so that most men have new bodies as they have new clothes; only with this difference, that we change our clothes commonly at once, but

* *Philosophical Essays*, Es. viii.

our bodies by degrees. And this is undeniably certain from experience. For, so much as our bodies grow, so much new matter is added to them, over and besides the repairing of what is continually spent; and after a man be come to his full growth, so much of his food as every day turns into nourishment, so much of his yesterday's body is usually wasted, and carried off by insensible perspiration, that is, breathed out at the pores of his body; which, according to the static experiment of Santorion, a learned physician, who, for several years together, weighed himself exactly every day, is (as I remember) according to the proportion of five to eight of all that a man eats and drinks. Now, according to this proportion, [which is now, however, considered too great,] a man must change his body several times in a year. It is true, indeed, the more solid parts of the body, as the bones, do not change so often as the fluid and fleshy; but that they also do change, is certain, because they *grow*; and whatever grows is nourished and spends, because otherwise it would not need to be repaired.

“2. The body which a man hath at any time of his life, is as much his own body, as that which he hath at his death; so that if the very matter of his body, which a man had at any time of his life, be raised, it is as much his own and the same body, as that which he had at his death? and commonly much more perfect; because they who die of lingering sickness, or old age, are usually mere skeletons when they die; so that there is no reason to suppose (or, at least, not to insist) that the very matter of which our bodies consist at the time of our death shall be that which shall be raised, that being commonly the worst and most imperfect body of all the rest.

“These two things being premised, the answer to this objection cannot be difficult. For as to the more solid and firm parts of the body, as the skull and bones, it is not, I think, pretended that the cannibals eat them; and if they did, so much of the matter, even of these solid parts, wastes away in a few years, as, being collected together, would supply them many times over. And as for the fleshy and fluid parts, these are so very often changed and renewed, that we can allow the cannibals to eat them all up, and to turn them all into nourishment and yet no man need contend for want of a body of his own at the resurrection, viz., any of those bodies which he had ten or twenty years before, and which are every whit as good, and as much his own, as that which was eaten.”*

Really, if the good Archbishop had written this specimen of grave philosophical reasoning in the way of irony, with the in-

tention of throwing ridicule on the doctrine it pretends to defend, I do not see how he could have succeeded better. It seems, according to this statement, that, at the resurrection, all men of moderate age will have at least a hundred bodies a-piece ! and as the soul is to wear but one, the difficulty will be, to choose which one, out of the hundred, shall be made immortal. But, in Dr. Hody's very pertinent language cited above, *if one, why not all !* And if, after all, at least ninety-nine parts out of a hundred of the precious matter, about which so much anxiety is displayed, is at last to be thrown away as refuse ; and if, as is likewise argued, it makes no difference which single part of the hundred is selected for preservation, each being "every whit as good" as the rest, and not a whit better ; thus, if, in plain language, in their intrinsic nature, all the hundred parts are mere refuse alike : why are they not all rejected as mere refuse alike ; and why, when ninety-nine of them are discarded, is one to be arbitrarily preserved ? Besides, how does this notable argument provide for the poor infant that dies as soon as born ? As it had never changed its body at all, how is it to get a more proper-sized one at the resurrection ? According to the hypothesis, though it does not signify how much of the matter which once belonged to the body is thrown away, yet no matter can be taken to form it which had not at one time or other belonged to it ; is, then, the babe that quits this world as soon as it comes into it, to be still an infant of a span at the resurrection, and to remain such forever ? To meet this case, I suppose it will be affirmed, that the body of the infant will be miraculously augmented to the stature of the adult. Thus, on the one hand it is insisted, that it is of no consequence if ninety-nine parts out of a hundred of the matter composing the original body be rejected ; and on the other hand it is admitted, that it is of no consequence if ninety-nine parts out of a hundred of the matter composing the resurrection-body be a new addition : whence again it is evident, that to contend for the resurrection of the same body, is only to assert in words, what is found, upon every theory, to be false in fact.

But Mr. Locke is the man for pouring upon such notions the genuine light of reason. His opponent, Stillingfleet, Bishop of Worcester, also deemed it essential to justice that the sinner's body should be raised for punishment as well as his soul ; indeed, he thought that, of right, the very same body in which every crime was committed should share in its punishment : but as this would make the bulk of the resurrection-body enormous, he had recourse to the same mode of surmounting this difficulty, as, we have just seen, was adopted by Tillotson,

Archbishop of Canterbury. He affirmed, that "it suffices, to make the same body, to have, not *all*, but *no other*, particles of matter, but such as were, some time or other, vitally united to the soul before." On which, among other conclusive remarks, Mr. Locke writes thus :

"Your lordship says, 'That you do not say the same individual particles [shall make up the body at the resurrection] which were united at the point of death ; for there must be a great alteration in them in a lingering disease ; as if a fat man falls into a consumption.' Because, it is likely, your lordship thinks, these particles of a decrepit, wasted, withered body, would be too few, or unfit, to make such a plump, strong, vigorous, well-sized body, as it has pleased your lordship to proportion out in your thoughts to men at the resurrection ; and, therefore, some small portion of the particles formerly united vitally to that man's soul, shall be re-assumed, to make up his body to the bulk your lordship judges convenient ; but the greatest part of them shall be left out, to avoid making his body more vast than your lordship thinks will be fit ; as appears by these your lordship's words immediately following, viz : "That you do not say, the same particles the sinner had at the very time of the commission of his sins ; for then a long sinner must have a vast body."

"But then, pray my lord, what must an embryo do, who dying within a few hours after his body was vitally united to his soul, has no particles of matter which were formerly united to it, to make up his body to that size and proportion, which your lordship seems to require in bodies at the resurrection ? Or, must we believe he shall remain content with that small pittance of matter, and that yet imperfect body, to eternity, because it is an article of faith to believe the resurrection of the very same body, *i. e.* made up of only such particles as have been vitally united to the soul ? For if it be true, as your lordship says, "That life is the result of the union of soul and body," it will follow, that the body of an embryo dying in the womb may be very little, not the thousandth part of any ordinary man. For, since from the first conception and beginning of formation it has life, and 'life is the result of the union of the soul with the body,' an embryo that shall die, either by the untimely death of the mother or by any other accident, presently after it has life, must according to your lordship's doctrine, remain a man not an inch long to eternity ; because there are not particles of matter, formerly united to his soul, to make him bigger, and no other can be made use of for that purpose : though what greater contiguity the soul hath with any particles of matter which were once vitally united to it, but are now so

no longer, than it hath with particles of matter which it was never united to, it would be hard to determine, if that should be demanded.

‘By these [most justly adds Mr. Locke], and not a few other the like consequences, one may see what service they do to religion and the Christian doctrine, who raise questions, and make articles of faith, about the resurrection of the same body, where the Scripture says nothing of the same body, or if it does, it is with no small reprimand to those who make such an inquiry. “But some men will say, How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come? Thou fool! that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die. And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain. — But God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him.”

It would scarcely be right to close this branch of the discussion, without adverting to the most extensive and laborious work upon this subject which has appeared in modern times. I allude to “An Essay on the Identity and General Resurrection of the Human Body,” by the late Rev. S. Drew. This respectable writer first appeared before the public in the character of a metaphysician; and he always regarded metaphysics as his *forte*. He, therefore, enters but slightly into the Scripture proof of the subject: but assuming that the Scriptures assert the resurrection of the body, he labors, by a long chain of fine-spun metaphysical reasoning, to evince how it must be. I apprehend, however, that none can read his very ingenious work, without feeling, that it is more calculated to raise doubts than to allay them. His theory is substantially the same with that of Dr. Watts and the Rabbins: indeed, Dr. A. Clarke supplies him, as corroboratory testimony, with the story about the bone *luz*. He supposes that no part whatever of the natural body will be raised again, except some very minute invisible particles, which he conceives, lie somewhere hidden in the interiors of the frame, are incapable either of addition or diminution from the hour of birth to that of death, and remain indestructible to eternity. He finds it utterly impossible that any other part of the present body can be taken to form the resurrection-body, than these invisible particles; and these, it is easy to see, he gratuitously assumes, or creates himself, for the purpose. He shows clearly, that *all* the particles which had ever been united, through life, to the corporeal mass cannot be taken to form the body at the resurrection, because these would, in many cases, form bodies so vast as to outrage all probability: beside which, the size of the body would then be in exact proportion to the time that the person had lived on earth; whence, while a child that died as soon as born

would still be a diminutive infant at the resurrection, the body of an antediluvian would be as big as a mountain. In addition to which, as he shows further, it is incontestable that many of the particles of some bodies have formed parts of more bodies than one. This difficulty, he demonstrates, is not all removed by the theory of some theologians, that not *all* the particles which have ever belonged to our bodies will be raised at the Resurrection, but only those which belonged to it at the time of death ; for some of the particles belonging, at death, to persons slain and eaten by cannibals, are certainly incorporated with the bodies of their devourers. Every other theory which can be constructed respecting the formation of the resurrection-body out of any number of the particles belonging to the present body, either during life or at the time of death, Mr. Drew also shows to include insurmountable difficulties. As, therefore, none of the common and fluctuating particles which have belonged to the body of clay, will serve for the composition of the resurrection-body, he at last adopts, as the only possible alternative, the gratuitous supposition I have already mentioned, and which he now states in these words : “ That some radical particles must be fixed within us, which constitute our sameness through all the mutations of life ; and which, remaining in a state of incorruptibility, shall put forth a germinating power beyond the grave, and be the germ of our future bodies.”

Now may we not ask, was there ever a more extravagant assumption ? *Incorruptible* particles *fixed* within us and *incapable*, as he also asserts, of either *increase* or *diminution* from birth to death ; — so fine and subtile that no microscope can detect them, no chemistry decompose them ; — and, while all the other particles of the frame become undistinguishably mixed with the elements, preserved snugly by themselves from the death even of Adam to the end of the world, through all the changes and catastrophes of the world and of nature ; then suddenly to rush into union with the returning soul, and to expand into the full dimensions of a proper-sized body !* Is it not surprising, that when a man of abilities saw the resurrection of the body to be untenable upon every hypothesis but this, he did not perceive that this was untenable as any, and admit it to be impossible to maintain any resurrection of the body at all ? Is it not astonishing that philosophers and divines should go so far out of the way to provide for man a resurrection-body, as to dream of unconscious, incorruptible, corporeal substance, — of fixed, unalterable, yet invisible matter ; — when the obvious truth lay so much nearer at hand ? Yes, Mr. Drew ! Man *has* an incorruptible germ within him, which will form the proper

* All this is asserted, p. 181, &c.

body of his soul hereafter. But this is not matter : it is no part of the material body, though contained within it. It is the proper substance of the soul itself, the form in which the soul lives when separated from its material covering : it is the *spiritual* body, to which, while we remain here, the natural body, in its every fibre, is a case or sheath. This does not lie useless and insensible, as Mr. Drew supposes his particles of incorruptible matter to do, from death till thousands of years afterwards. It comes at once into its full and proper life and activity ; and man lives, though a spirit, still a man, and in a really substantial though spiritual body, from the day of his mortal dissolution to all eternity.

SECTION III.

THE RESURRECTION.

PART IV.

Scripture Evidence of the True Doctrine.

Passing, at length, from the negative proofs of the non-resurrection of the material body, — having seen that there is nothing in Scripture, nor yet in the conclusions of sound reason, which sanctions the notion of such a resurrection, but that, at least from the last source of evidence, there is much that conclusively disproves it ; — I will now adduce some of the direct evidence of Scripture in favor of that view of the Resurrection, which we accept as the genuine doctrine of the Word of God ; viz ; That man rises from the grave of his dead material body immediately after death ; that he then finds himself in a world, not of mere shadows, but of substantial existences, himself being a real and substantial man in perfect human form ; and that, consequently, the dead material body will never be re-assumed.

I will commence with considering the celebrated fifteenth chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians. I begin with this, because, some having referred to it as favoring the opposite doctrine, it is important to settle its true design, before proceeding to texts of which the meaning is quite unequivocal.

I will first notice the parts of the chapter which have been cited in proof of the doctrine of our opponents.

“But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all died, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the first-fruits; afterward, they that are Christ’s at his coming.”* It has hence been contended, very truly, that “his [Christ’s] resurrection is set forth as a sure pledge of ours.” But the meaning of those who advance this is, that our resurrection is to be exactly of the same kind as our Divine Prototype’s: thus it is argued, from the term “first-fruits;” “The word *first* indicates a subsequent or successive number, more or less. If Christ were the only one to rise from the dead, bodily; then it might with equal propriety have been said, — Christ the *last-fruits*, &c.” The author of this objection seems to have forgotten, that the Lord Jesus Christ actually does say of himself, “I am the *First* and the *Last*.” (Rev. i. 17): and we shall perhaps find that this is perfectly true, even with respect to his resurrection.

It is necessary here to be borne in mind, that throughout this chapter, and generally elsewhere,† the Apostle never separates in his thoughts the idea of *resurrection* from that of *regeneration*: and it is impossible to apply what he says of the resurrection to any but the regenerate. As remarked by Doddridge, it is “of the resurrection of [true] Christians alone, and not of that of the wicked, that he evidently speaks in this whole chapter.” Having the idea of the spiritual resurrection thus combined in his mind with that of resuscitation from natural death, and the former idea being generally uppermost in his thoughts, his language is often more strictly applicable to the former resurrection than to the latter. His meaning here is rendered evident by his language elsewhere. “Know ye not,” says he, “that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism *unto death*; that like as Christ was *raised from the dead* by the glory of the Father, even so we also *should walk in newness of life*. For if we have been planted together in *the likeness of his death*, we shall be also in *the likeness of his resurrection*: Knowing this, that *our old man is crucified with him*, that *the body of sin might be destroyed*, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is *dead* is *freed from sin*. Now if we *be dead with Christ*, we believe that we shall also *live with him*: knowing that Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more: death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he died, he died unto sin once; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God,

* Ver. 20 — 23.

† See the remarks above on Phil. iii. 21 (p. 77).

Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be *dead indeed unto sin*, but *alive unto God* through Jesus Christ our Lord."* Thus the Apostle, by our dying in Adam, means, chiefly, death as regards spiritual life; by our dying after the likeness of the death of Christ, he means a death to the former death, or a being "freed from [the power of] sin," "the body of sin being destroyed," or the life of the merely external man being extinguished; and by our experiencing "the likeness of Christ's resurrection, he means our "walking in newness of life. — Nothing can be more explicit. Evidently, it is in this sense, mainly, that he speaks to the Corinthians of Christ as our "first-fruits," of "the resurrection of the dead" as coming by Him, and of being "made alive" in him. Hence *he excludes the wicked from having any share in the resurrection he is here treating of*; he confines it to "*them that are Christ's*." None however, deny that the wicked are to partake of the *general* resurrection as well as the good: his excluding the wicked, therefore proves, that he is here treating, primarily, of a purely spiritual resurrection; and as this is accompanied with a new formation of our spiritual frame, which emerges from the natural body at natural death, therefore he regards this resurrection as a mere necessary consequence from the former.

That the phrase, "Christ the first-fruits," does also relate to the resuscitation of the good man from natural death, in his spiritual body as formed anew by regeneration, I therefore readily admit. But that, in this application, it does not literally mean that he was the first that ever rose from the dead, is evident from the fact, that literally, he was not the first. Do we not read of several who were raised from the dead by the prophets in the Old Testament? Did not the Lord Jesus Christ raise several from the dead before he died himself, and thus before he rose again? But perhaps our opponents, as these facts cannot be denied, will shift their ground, and say, that they do not mean that he was the first that rose, but that he was the first who ascended with his body to heaven. But how does this agree with what the same parties believe, that Enoch and Elijah ascended to heaven with their natural bodies long before. *We*, indeed, are convinced, that neither Enoch nor Elijah ascended to heaven in their bodies, just as we are convinced that the phrase, "Christ the first-fruits," does not mean that Christ was literally the first who ever rose; but our opponents affirm both, though by maintaining the one they negative the other.

If then, in application to the subject of the resuscitation from

* Romans vi. 3 — 11.

the dead, the expression, "Christ the first-fruits," does not mean that he was first in point of time, what does the Apostle intend by the expression? The same doubtless, as when he calls Jesus Christ, in reference to another subject, the *Author* (and Finisher of our faith.* The words, also, used in the original, are very similar: both are compounds of *arche*, the beginning, and, as applied to the Lord, *the origin, or source*. That translated *first-fruits*, (*aparche*), is literally, *from the beginning*; and that translated *author* (*archegos*) is properly *he who precedes another, as leader*. If then it is right, as it certainly is, to translate the latter word, when applied to the Lord, *the Author*, and to understand that the Apostle means by his use of it, to direct us to him as the Author of the Christian faith; it would be equally right to translate the former word also, when applied to the Lord, *the Author*, and to understand that the Apostle means to direct us to him as the author of *the Christian's* resurrection. Thus the Lord applies to himself the more universal term (*arche*), which is the root of both these, to indicate that he is the *Author* of all things to his Church: "I am Alpha and Omega, *the beginning* (*arche*) and the end, the first and the last" (Rev. xxii. 13); — "These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, *the beginning* (*arche*) of the creation of God" (Ch. iii. 14).

It is certain then that Jesus Christ is our *First-Fruits*, according to this spiritual idea, — our *Aparche*, — both in respect to the true Christian's resurrection from natural death and his resurrection from the death of sin, — that he is the Author both of the one and of the other: but does it thence follow, that because he rose with his natural body glorified, we are to rise with our natural bodies also? The Apostle's language certainly does not imply this, but the contrary. For he says, "But every man *in his own order*; Christ the first-fruits; *afterward* they that are Christ's;" where the words *order* and *afterward* do not refer to order and sequence of time, but of rank; indeed, the word translated *order* might properly be translated *rank*; it being the term (*tagma*, whence our *tactics*) appropriated to the marshalling of an army. It is also shown by the lexicographers, that *aparche* means what is first, or primary, with respect to *dignity* or *excellence*, as well as with respect to time.† Thus the Apostle explicitly informs us, that our resurrection is not to be of the same order, or rank, as that of the Lord, but that as his was a resurrection suited to his nature, so will ours be a resurrection suited to ours. He therefore rose with his whole body complete, though it was now no longer a material but a "glorious" or divine body, and thus he lives and reigns as a Divine *Man*: if otherwise, his saving influences could not extend to man

* Heb. xii. 2.

† See Schleusner.

in his natural state in the world, who thus would be left where he was before, and would derive no benefit from the Lord's assumption of, and resurrection with, the human nature. For the sake of men in the world, and that he might be eternally present with men in the world, the Lord rose to glory with all that belongs to a man in the world, that he might thence immediately act upon and influence him: but as, when man leaves the world, *he* has done with it for ever, it is quite unnecessary that he should take with him that body which was the medium by which his soul communicated immediately with the world; and therefore, though he rises with his spiritual body, to be the medium of his communicating with the spiritual world, he does not, like his Divine Prototype, take with him his natural body in addition, because he does not, like Him, continue to communicate immediately with the natural world also. In this respect then, most truly, in the quaint language of the objector, the Lord is the *last-fruits* as well as the *first*; or in his own divine language, he is the First and the Last, — the only Being who is once in last principles and in first; — who is the Originator of all things, — the First; — and the Sustainer of all things, — the Last. Thus we see that it was not without reason that the Apostle introduces the remark, "But *every one* (not *every man*, but *every one*, or *each*, *ekastos*), in his own order;" — that he meant to apprise us, that the resurrection of the Lord was of a different order from that of man. But the Apostle adds the words, "at his coming;" — "afterward, they that are Christ's at his coming;" — whence some infer, that he postpones the resurrection that he speaks of to the end of the world. We have already conclusively seen, that the nature and time of the Lord's second coming were not in that age revealed, even to the Apostles. This Apostle, therefore, entertaining the opinion that the Lord's second coming would be witnessed by that generation, might naturally refer their great *change* (to be treated of presently) to the time of that event. But, certainly, the resuscitation of the regenerate, — of *them that are Christ's*, — in their spiritual body, takes place at their death; and it is admitted by all, that the hour of death is often referred to in the Scriptures, as a coming of the Lord, — "his coming," as Dr. Watts expresses it, "by his messenger of death." In a purely spiritual sense, it is certainly a coming of the Lord to the soul, when a man, in the Apostle's language before quoted, "lives with him," or when, being "dead unto sin," he becomes "alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord:" assuredly, then, when the spiritual body which is formed anew by the regeneration, in lieu of the "body of sin," emerges from its shell of clay and appears before the Lord in the eternal world, it is, to the man, the coming of the Lord.

At the close of the Chapter, the Apostle speaks more particularly of the manner and time of our exchanging our natural body for the spiritual one. He refers it, indeed, *as to those then living*, to a period which has proved very distant, and which most believe to be yet unarrived: but he only does so, because he expected, as we have fully seen already, the Lord's second coming to occur in the life-time of that generation, and probably of himself. Thus no valid inference can hence be drawn as to a future resurrection of the material body. All who should be deceased previously to the Lord's second coming, he considers as having, also, previously experienced their resurrection; all who should then be living in the world, as passing through a change, the same as death had effected in the others. With these facts in the mind, there will be no difficulty in reconciling what he here says, with his doctrine in the preceding part of the chapter and elsewhere, which, as we shall find, is the clear new church doctrine of the resurrection.

Addressing the Corinthians of that generation, he says, "Behold I show you a mystery. *We* shall not *all* sleep, but we shall *all* be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible; and *we* shall be changed."

* It is generally supposed, that the Apostle here refers to a coming of the Lord to put an end to the world; and it is sufficiently probable, that if he did not expect the world to be absolutely destroyed at the Lord's second coming, he expected a great change to be made in the state of it. When, therefore, he says, "*We* shall not *all* sleep," he certainly appears to mean, that all that generation would not previously die, but some would be living to witness the occurrence. When he adds, "but we shall *all* be changed," he means that some then living would previously have undergone the change made by death, and the rest, who should still be alive, would undergo a similar change *then*. When he says that this will be effected "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump," he seems to mean that the change will be sudden with all, both with those who would previously have died and those who should then be alive: but we shall find abundant proof, presently, that he cannot mean that the previously deceased would not undergo *their* change, till those who he expects would be living, should undergo theirs: he only means that the change would be sudden with all, though not occurring at the same time. So when he says, "and the dead shall be raised incorruptible," he does not mean to say, that there would be no resurrection of the dead till that period: for, as we have already

* Ver. 51, 52.

noticed, and shall further evince presently, his Divine Master taught, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, — consequently all who had departed out of the world, — were already enjoying the “resurrection from the dead;” and the doctrine of the Apostle, as we shall also soon see, was the very same. That this in fact, is the Apostle’s meaning in this very passage, is perfectly clear from the exactly parallel passage which we have already considered from his first Epistle to the Thessalonians;* where he says, “Them also which sleep in Jesus shall God bring *with him* ;”† plainly evincing, that when he afterwards says, “And the dead in Christ *shall rise first*,”‡ he means, that they would *have risen before*, otherwise Jesus could not *bring them with him*. The same is the only true meaning, and that which alone, the Apostle, to be consistent with himself, could intend, when he here says to the Corinthians, “and the dead shall be raised incorruptible.”

The truth is, that this passage to the Corinthians is, in all important particulars, parallel to the passage to the Thessalonians, and is to be understood in exactly the same manner. It is another varied recital of the Lord’s words in Matt. xxiv. 30, 31 : and *they* do not relate to the resurrection, or the passing out of this world into the other, at all : and, like the quotation to the Thessalonians of the same portion of the Lord’s prophetic discourse, it evinces, that the Lord did not see fit that the true nature and time of his second coming should then be openly revealed ; whence even the Apostles were permitted to entertain, *upon this one subject*, obscure, and in some respects, erroneous ideas, expecting it to take place literally, as described figuratively, in the life-time of that generation and probably in their own. Thus Paul, mistakingly including himself, here says, “*We* shall not all sleep ;” just as, when writing to the Thessalonians, he said, “*We* that are *alive*, and *remain*.” The second coming of the Lord, being, as we have seen at large in the preceding Section, only to take place, in this world, in a spiritual manner, though accompanied, in the spiritual world, with representative appearances, has no immediate connection with the subject of the resurrection ; but the Apostle, expecting it then soon to take place, illustrates and enforces his doctrine of the resurrection, both to the Thessalonians and to the Corinthians by assuring them that even they who should be living at the time would not pass into the state of future blessedness with their material bodies, but would experience the same transition out of the natural body into the spiritual body which others experience at death ; that they should then meet their faithful brethren who were gone before, and, together with them, “be ever with the Lord.”§

* See above, pp. 61, 62, 63. † Ch. iv. 14. ‡ Ver. 16. § 1 Thes. iv. 13, 14, 17.

This, I repeat, is plainly the import of the words now before us; "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed." Though, it appears, the words, "*We shall not all sleep,*" must be admitted to convey the erroneous expectation, that the Apostle and others would be found living at the time of the Lord's second coming, not having passed through natural death; yet he connects this harmless error with the grand, universal truth, "we shall all be changed;" plainly affirming that all, whether dying in the ordinary way or not, will pass from a natural state to a spiritual one before they can enter their eternal abode, being divested of the natural body and appearing in the spiritual body; agreeably to his previous declarations, to be considered presently, that "there is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body;" and "that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." This interpretation is indeed so obvious, that it has forced itself on other theological writers. The Rev. Mr. Drew has these judicious remarks: "Though" (taking the prophecy literally) "the last generation of the human race shall be exempted from the stroke of death, yet, *the change itself which death produces shall not be dispensed with.* For though "*all shall not sleep,*" yet "*all shall be changed.* The change seems absolutely necessary, by what means soever it may be produced, to the production of that *spiritual* body which we have already considered. The *change*, therefore, through which these last individuals of mankind shall pass, *must be*, in its nature, *equivalent to that which death*, by a much slower and more gradual process, *shall produce upon the great mass of the human race.*"* Again: "As 'flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God,' 'nor corruption inherit incorruption,' these corruptible and visible parts, which we behold, must disappear, either through the process of the grave, or of that *change* which shall supersede its necessity. The *real body, which shall be hereafter, must therefore at present be concealed beneath those exuviae which shall be done away in death.* It seems reserved for a future state of existence; while those parts which will appear as appendages, when, from eternity, we look back on time, seem destined to perform the functions of the present life."† Nothing can be more clear and satisfactory, — can more obviously result from the unrestrained words of the Apostle.

Thus this famous passage, so commonly referred to as a proof-text for the resurrection, or the passing into heaven, of the material body, turns out (when allowance is made for the Apostle's quoting the symbolic language of the Lord's prophecies, and seeming to take that symbolic language in its literal

* Essay, p. 470.

† Ibid. pp. 477, 478.

sense) not in the least to favor any such doctrine, but yields strong support, our enemies themselves being judges, to the great truths, that there is no passing out of time into eternity but in a spiritual body, — that man exists in such a body immediately after death, — and that if any case can exist (as with Elijah) in which ordinary death is not experienced, the very same change as ordinary death produces is nevertheless undergone.

I have adopted the above view of the text in question, somewhat differing from the slighter explanation given in the first edition of this work, because, on mature consideration, I believe it to be the sense intended by the Apostle. It precludes the necessity of having recourse to any spiritual interpretation of his words. For although this were not unallowable, when as here, he speaks “by the word of the Lord,”* that is, *from the word spoken by the Lord and recorded in the gospels*, which regularly includes a spiritual sense in every part; yet, the spiritual and genuine sense of every thing relating to the Lord’s second coming having intentionally been kept hidden from the preachers of the truths belonging to his first, that spiritual meaning could not be the meaning intended *by them*. When, therefore, they quote or refer to such passages according to their literal sense, they doubtless understood them in that sense; and, as has been fully shown above,† their ignorance of things *beyond their commission*, detracts nothing from their adequate and inspired knowledge of the things which came within it.

But if there are a few expressions in this chapter, which, when the allusions are not understood, may appear to some to favor the notion of a future resurrection of the material body, let them take a view of the whole chapter together, and every such appearance must vanish.

Let us, then, look at *the general scope* of the Apostle’s argument, — at *the design* with which the whole chapter was composed. Was it written to prove the doctrine of a *resurrection*, or of a *future state* in *general*; or to prove the *resurrection of the material body*?

“Now if Christ be preached, that he arose from the dead,” says the Apostle when he commences the subject, “how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?”‡ Does this mean, no resurrection of dead bodies; or, no rising in eternal life of those who have left this world by death? A few verses below we find an answer to this inquiry. The Apostle says, “If the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised: and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ

* 1 Thess. iv. 15.

† Pp. 16—25.

‡ Ver. 12.

are perished. If *in this life only* we have hope, we are of all men most miserable.”* Here the plain scope of the Apostle’s argument is explicitly declared. He is reasoning against those who confined their hopes of happiness *to this life only*. He is disproving the monstrous error of supposing that the Christian’s hope terminates *here*: and surely this awful mistake is guarded against, quite as effectually, by the doctrine which teaches that we shall rise again, and appear before our judge, immediately after death, in bodies adapted for the fullest sense either of happiness or misery, as by the doctrine which teaches that we are not to be judged at all, nor even to have any distinct consciousness of existence, till the end of the world. Evident then it is, that the Apostle is writing against those who deny a resurrection altogether; not against those who do not expect a resurrection of the body. Accordingly, he says presently, “What shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead *rise not at all*?”† Now whatever this baptizing for the dead might be, the Apostle clearly affirms that the use of it would be frustrated, not if *the dead body never rises*, but if the dead *rise not AT ALL*. So he proceeds, still arguing against the idea, not that there is no resurrection of the body, but that there is no future life, “And why stand we in jeopardy every hour? I protest by the rejoicing which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord, I die daily [meaning that he was constantly exposing himself to the danger of dying; and was also mortifying in himself the life of the merely natural man]. If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.”‡ Here the Apostle puts us still more clearly in possession of the whole scope of his argument. Nothing can be plainer than that he is solely contending for a future life, — a state of retribution, — against the monstrous grossness of those who imagined that there is no resurrection whatever, and that when we die here we are extinct forever. The resurrection of *the body*, then, *has nothing to do with the grand design of his argument*.

The Apostle, having thus settled so conclusively the main question, proceeds to answer those who objected to the doctrine of man’s immortality, in consequence of observing, that the natural body was cast at death into the ground, and was there decomposed, without anything of the man any where remaining visible.

“But some will say,” he observes, “How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come? Thou fool,” he replies, “that which thou sowest [alluding to the operations of the husbandman] is not quickened except it die. And that

* Ver. 16—19.

† Ver. 29.

‡ Ver. 30, 81, 82.

which thou sowest, thou sowest *not that body which shall be*, but bear grain, it may chance of wheat or some other grain. But God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body.”* Here we have the most unequivocal assertion, that man does not rise again, with the same body as he had in the world. And to show that man may have a different body suited to the different state on which he enters after death, he proceeds to illustrate it by similitudes from various natural objects. “All flesh,” says he, “is not the same flesh: there is one kind of flesh of men, another of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds. There are also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial: but the glory [or form, or nature, as the original word here signifies] of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another. There is one glory [*form or nature*] of the sun, another glory of the moon, and another of the stars; for one star differeth from another star in glory.”† Was it possible to prepare the mind more naturally for the admission of the idea, that though the natural body rises no more, man is not therefore left destitute of a body, but has a better in its place? To what purpose could this enumeration of different species of bodies serve, but to answer the objections of those who concluded, that because the body which was laid in the grave remains there, therefore there is no resurrection of the man?

He proceeds: “So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption: It is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory; It is sown in weakness; it is raised in power.”‡ Now he comes to the full, clear, New-Jerusalem doctrine: “*It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body:*” “or, as the words might more exactly, and without any ambiguity, be translated. “*A natural body is sown: a spiritual body is raised.*”

It is well worthy of note, “that the word *sown* does not relate to the body’s *being laid in the earth*, but rather to its *production in the world*; for when it is interred, it is no more an animal body, but a body void of life: it is not only *weak*, but wholly *destitute of power*. The Apostle does indeed (ver. 36, 37) speak of *seed* sown in the earth; but then he speaks of it as *still alive*, and having its seminal virtue, or animal-spirit, in it, and afterwards dying *there*: whereas our bodies *first* die, and *then* are cast in the earth:”§ It is when we come into this world, then, that “*a natural body is sown:*” when we depart out of it, “*a spiritual body is raised.*” To confirm this grand idea, the Apostle solemnly repeats it as a general truth: “There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body”||—a

* Ver. 35—38.

† Ver. 39, 40, 41

‡ Ver. 42, 43.

§ Whitby’s Commentary.

|| Ver. 44.

most certain fact, on which rests the whole doctrine of the New Jerusalem respecting the life after death. "*There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body!*" and the latter is not less real, nor less truly substantial, than the former.

In the next verse he illustrates this great truth by the example of Adam, though the reference is quite lost in our translation; in which it is given, "And so it is written, The first Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam [not, *was made*, but] is a quickening spirit."* How does this illustrate the case of the natural and spiritual body? Because the word here used for *soul* (*psyche*) is that always applied by the Apostle to signify *the natural or animal soul*; or *the life of the natural or animal man*: it is the substantive from which the adjective always translated *natural* (*psychicos*) in the New Testament, is formed. Thus, to introduce the word *natural*, answering to what had gone before, we might read it, "the first Adam was made a living *natural* principle, but the last Adam is a life-giving spiritual principle;" in other words, "The first Adam was endued with *natural life*, and the last Adam is the communicator of spiritual life:" with which idea in our minds we see the propriety of the verse which follows: "Howbeit, that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterwards that which is spiritual."† Thus the Apostle means to state this most accurately discriminated and beautiful truth; That *there is just such a difference between our natural and spiritual body, as there is between the nature which we receive by birth from Adam, and that which we receive by regeneration from the Lord*. This he further illustrates by adding, "The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly."‡ Here he shows, that, with the good, of whom alone he is speaking, the resurrection-body is the proper form and image of the regenerate mind. Then he makes this general statement: "Now this I say brethren, that *flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.*"§ What can be clearer? How is this to be evaded? This is precisely what we believe. The Apostle is arguing as strongly as possible against the notion of the resurrection of the natural body, as being of such substance as cannot enter heaven; and in proof that such resurrection is unnecessary to our future conscious existence, he demonstrates that there is a spiritual body, independent of the former, and

* Ver. 45.

‡ Ver. 47, 48, 49.

† Ver. 46.

§ Ver. 50.

which emerges out of the shell of flesh and blood when this is laid aside by death.

What follows, about being changed at the Lord's coming, we have already noticed. And when to this the Apostle adds, "For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality,"* he certainly *cannot* mean to say this of the natural body, "the flesh and blood," which, he had just before declared, "*cannot* inherit the kingdom of God ;"—nor of that "corruption" which he had said, as explicitly, "*doth not* inherit incorruption," or *cannot* be made incorruptible. To be consistent with himself, then, he must mean, speaking in a strongly figurative style, that this corruptible state and body shall be *exchanged* for the incorruptible, this mortal for immortal: and thus he comes to the sublime conclusion: "So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory."

Once more I will call in the powerful aid of that great master of lucid argument whom I have several times cited already.

The Bishop of Worcester had quoted various parts of this chapter as favoring his doctrine of the resurrection of the same body; and Mr. Locke replies to him in such a manner as to make his arguments appear extravagantly absurd, and proves the doctrine of the Apostle to be directly the contrary. See, especially, his remarks on the *seed sown*, which the Bishop had labored to explain into agreement with his doctrine of the resurrection of the *same body*. But I will only here cite from Mr. L. some important remarks on the distinction between *the dead* (*oi necroi*), in the masculine gender, and *the bodies* of the dead (*somata*), in the neuter gender; which distinction of genders cannot be expressed in our tongue: whence it is not so clear in English as in the original, that *the dead* are not *the dead bodies*. "He who reads," says Mr. Locke, "with attention this discourse of St. Paul, where he discourses of the resurrection, will see, that he plainly distinguishes between *the dead* that shall be raised, and *the bodies* of the dead. For it is *necroi* [*the dead*], *pantes* [*all*], *oi* [*they*], are the nominative cases (Ver. 15, 22, 23, 29, 32, 35, 52) to *egeirontai* [*rise*], *zoopoiethesontai* [*shall be made alive*], *egerthesontai* [*shall be raised*], all along, and not *somata*, *bodies*; which one may with reason think would somewhere or other have been expressed, if all this had been said to propose it as an article of faith, that the very same bodies should be raised. The same manner of speaking the Spirit of God observes through all the New Testament; where

* Ver. 53.

it is said, 'raise *the dead*,' 'quicken or make alive *the dead*,' 'the resurrection of *the dead*,' (Matt. xxii. 31, Mark xii. 26, John v. 21, Acts xxvi. 23, Rom. iv. 17, 2 Cor. i. 9, 1 Thess. iv. 14, 16). Nay, those very words of our Saviour, urged by your Lordship for the resurrection of the same body, run thus: *Pantes oi, &c.* (ALL [in the masculine gender] *that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, THEY that have done good to the resurrection of life, and THEY that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation*). Would not a well-meaning searcher of the Scriptures be apt to think, that if the thing here intended by our Saviour were to teach, and propose it as an article of faith necessary to be believed by every one, that the very same bodies of the dead should be raised; would not, I say, any one be apt to think, that if our Saviour meant so, the words should rather have been *panta ta somata, &c.* — "*all the bodies that are in the graves,*" rather than "*all who are in the graves;*" which must denote *persons*, and not precisely *bodies*?—Another evidence, Mr. L. continues, "that St. Paul makes a distinction between *the dead* and *the bodies* of the dead, so that *the dead* cannot be taken in this chapter to stand precisely for *the bodies* of the dead, are these words of the Apostle: *But some men will say, How are the dead raised? and with what bodies do they come?* Which words, *dead* and *they*, if supposed to stand precisely for *the bodies* of the dead, the question will run thus: *How are the dead bodies raised? and with what bodies do the dead bodies come?* Which seems to have no very agreeable sense." On the whole, therefore, he concludes, that "if a man shall think himself bound to determine concerning the identity of the bodies of the dead raised at the last day, he will not, by the remainder of St. Paul's answer, find the determination of the Apostle to be much in favor of the very same body; unless the being told, that the body sown *is not the body that shall be*; that the body raised is *as different from that which was laid down, as the flesh of man is from the flesh of beasts, fishes, and birds,—or, as the sun, moon, and stars are different from each other,—or, as different as a corruptible, weak, natural, mortal body, is from an incorruptible, powerful, spiritual, immortal body*; and lastly, *as different as a body that is flesh and blood is from a body that is NOT flesh and blood*: — '*for flesh and blood CANNOT,*' says St. Paul in this very place, '*inherit the kingdom of God*:' unless, I say, all this can be supposed to be the way to deliver this as an article of faith, which is required to be believed by every one, viz: That the dead should be raised with the very same bodies that they had before in this life."

From this review, I think it may be seen to be undeniable,

that the whole of this chapter harmonizes with, and a great portion, directly teaches, the New-Church doctrine of the resurrection. Beside what has already been remarked, it is plain that the Apostle does not allow of an intermediate reservation of the soul somewhere by itself, unclothed with any spiritual body, till the natural body is raised and joined again to it; a doctrine that has been invented to make the passages which openly speak of the immediate resurrection of the soul seem to be combinable with the doctrine of the resurrection of the body; he speaks of the raising of the spiritual body as the only resurrection, and never hints at the soul as existing separately from the spiritual body. It is necessary then to understand the whole of an immediate resurrection, upon the death, or other equivalent change or mode of putting off, of the body.

And we *must* so understand it, unless we would place the Apostle in contradiction to himself; since it is plain, from other passages, that he expected such an immediate resurrection, and *that* in a real but spiritual body, *as soon as he should be removed from the world by death*. This, therefore, we will now proceed to show.

We find him speaking to the Philippians in these decided terms, "For me, to live is Christ, and to die is gain."* He adds, "For I am in a strait between two; having a desire to depart and *be with Christ*, which is far better."† This is one of the passages, from which an intelligent orthodox theologian concludes, that "at death the soul quits the body, to return to it no more."‡ "When," he observes, "the Apostle says, 'for me to live is Christ,' he declares that the present life was to him a source of high enjoyment. But if he did not exist in a separate state, his death would put an end to all his enjoyment, being an absolute termination of consciousness. If then he had the least degree of enjoyment while living, his death, destroying this enjoyment, and supplying no other in its place would, with mathematical certainty, be a *loss* to him. How much greater must this loss be, when, as he informs us, *it was Christ to him to live!* Can any sober man believe, that St. Paul meant to declare death, which, according to the opposite scheme, is a mere temporary annihilation, to be a greater good than the happiness indicated by this expressive phraseology? But the Apostle himself has determined this point. He has told us, that the *gain* of his departure consisted in *being with Christ*, in a state of happiness totally superior to any thing he found in this present world." Surely we must admit this to be conclusive reasoning. Paul was convinced that he was going to dwell in the immediate presence and enjoyment of his Saviour

* Phil. i. 21. † Ver. 23. ‡ Dwight's Theology, Sermon 164.

God. This he expected immediately on his being separated from his material body. Now can it be imagined, that to reunite him, at some period, with his material body, could have the effect of bringing him *nearer* to his Saviour, and thus of *increasing* his enjoyment? The Apostle knew that the *putting off* of his material frame would bring him *nearer* to his Saviour than he could be while he was in it: can it be conceived that the *putting of it on again* would improve the effect of the *putting of it off*, and bring him *nearer* still? The idea is preposterous in the extreme. If the *putting off* of the body brings a good man *nearer* to his God, it is quite evident that the *resuming* of it must have the effect of taking him *farther off again*,—of shutting him again *more out from his God*, and from the enjoyments which are only to be found in nearness to him, “in whose presence is fulness of joy, and at whose right hand there are pleasures for evermore.” Even supposing the material body, when resumed, to be ever so much subtilized and refined; this could only in some degree diminish its weighing down—its distancing quality, but could not possibly remove it altogether; much less could it impart to it an opposite quality, and bring the man, on putting it on again, nearer to the Lord than he had reached in consequence of putting it off. All this, doubtless, the Apostle well knew; and would, in consequence, have been filled with horror at the thought of a re-union with his fleshly covering.

But that he fully expected to enter upon his eternal inheritance immediately on death, and then to be clothed with his immortal body, is indisputable, when we attend to what he says to the Corinthians in his second epistle. After having remarked that our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory:* he goes on to show that this is to be entered upon *as soon as our earthly body dies*, saying, “For we know that if our earthly tabernacle were dissolved,” (no person, I suppose, will dispute, that our earthly tabernacle is the body in which we live on earth:—*so soon then as this is dissolved*) “we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens:”†—consequently, by this house in the heavens, as opposed to the earthly tabernacle of the natural body, he means the spiritual body, in which dwells the soul of the faithful after death.

“For this,” he adds, “we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven: if so be that, being clothed, we shall not be found naked.”‡ Here by being clothed upon by the house from heaven, he must mean, to appear in such a body as is enjoyed by the angels, which is

* 2 Cor. iv. 17.

† Chap. v. 1.

‡ Ver. 2. 3.

the image of the divine graces that adorn their minds, and which is formed such while man lives in the world, according as those graces find in him an abiding place: and by being found naked, he means, to be, indeed, in a spiritual body, as being stripped of the natural body, but in such a one as cannot appear in heaven, being the form and image of all our natural corruptions, of which nakedness, and shame are constantly predicated in the language of inspiration.

He subjoins, "For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burthened: not for that we would be unclothed," — that is, not frowardly desiring to die, — "but clothed upon," — invested with a truly heavenly as well as spiritual form, — "that mortality might be swallowed up of life."* It is plain, then, that he expected such a glorious investment to take place, with the faithful, immediately after death; accordingly he adds presently, "Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, while we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord; we are confident, I say, willing rather *to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord.*"† Here then we find, indisputably, that, with the faithful, when the earthly tabernacle is put off the heavenly one is put on, and that as soon as they are absent from the body they are present with the Lord, — that is, *immediately after death.*

Carrying on therefore the same ideas, he proceeds to show, that every one in particular is judged, also, immediately after death, without coming back to take the material body for the purpose: thus he immediately adds, "Wherefore we labor, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him. — For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in the body," (mind that, — done *in the body, though that is now put off,*) "according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." Who can read these words, and suppose that the Apostle had any idea of returning to resume his dead body, before he was thus to "appear before the judgment-seat of Christ?" Or who can imagine, that, after having had his doom decided "before the judgment-seat of Christ," he expected to be sent back again to re-animate his body of dust? Evidently then the Apostle believed, that when once he had laid this down, he had done with it forever; and was well satisfied with the expectation of entering, instead of it, into the sensible possession of his spiritual body, — of his "house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." In the same manner, he intimately connects together death and judgment elsewhere; "It is appointed unto all men once to die, but after this the judgment:"‡ on which the pious

* Ver. 4.

† Ver. 6, 7, 8.

‡ Heb. ix. 27.

Watts judiciously remarks, "whether immediate or more distant is not here expressly declared; though the immediate connection of the words *hardly gives room for seventeen hundred years to intervene.*"* Accordingly, Dr. Dwight, after having proved, as already noticed, "1. That at death the soul quits the body, *to return to it no more,*" demonstrates from Scripture, "2. That the soul after death returns *immediately to God, to give an account of its conduct in the present life.*" "3. That the sentence of God will be pronounced in perfect righteousness on all that it has done: and, "4. That in consequence of this sentence, the soul will *immediately enter upon a state of reward.*"

We have before seen,† that the passages in the writings of the Apostle Paul which are commonly cited in proof of the resurrection of the material body, in reality prove no such doctrine, but the contrary; and that the few expressions which *might* be understood as applying to a resurrection at some distant period, by no means *require* such an interpretation: We have now seen, that to put such an interpretation upon them is to make the Apostle contradict himself; for that his doctrine unequivocally is, that man rises again immediately after death;—that as soon as his "earthly house," or material body, is dissolved, the good man is clothed with a spiritual body of celestial origin, "a house from heaven;" while the wicked man is "found naked," having a spiritual body indeed, but not of heavenly origin, and all the deformity and shame of which is discovered when divested of its outer clothing of clay;—that a particular judgment is then immediately passed on all, for all then "appear before the judgment-seat of Christ;"—and that the good being then "absent from the body" and "present with the Lord," immediately have their "light affliction, which is but for a moment," recompensed with "a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." Thus, when the whole of his testimony is brought together, is not this Apostle a most decided preacher of the doctrine, upon this subject, which we offer as that of the New Jerusalem?

As these are the sentiments of the Apostle Paul, so also are they those of his Divine Master. In opening the subject above,‡ I adduced one or two of the explicit declarations in which the Lord Jesus Christ propounds the doctrine of an immediate resurrection; I will here add one or two more of his statements to that effect.

What then can be more decisive than the Lord's declaration

* Works, Leeds Edit. vol. vii. p. 7.

† In Parts 1. and 11. and also in this Fourth Part, of this Section.

‡ Part 1. of this Section.

from the cross to the penitent thief: "Verily I say unto thee, *To-day* shalt thou be with me in paradise?"* Paradise is here usually explained to be, not heaven, or the final state of blessedness, but merely a happy part of the intermediate region called *Hades*, in which, it is supposed, the soul is to wait for its re-union with the body. Certain, however, it is that in the only other place in which the word *paradise* occurs, (where also, as here, it comes from the mouth of the Lord Jesus Christ), it is employed to express man's final and highest state of bliss; for it is said, "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God."† Can any suppose, that the reward here promised to the victor in spiritual conflicts is only a comfortable situation in the intermediate state called *Hades*? Does it not evidently refer to his final happiness in heaven? The *probability*, then, certainly is, that when the Lord Jesus Christ says to the penitent, "*To-day* shalt thou be with me in paradise," he promises him an immediate admission into his final state of happiness: consequently, as he did not, then take his material body thither, it is inconsistent with this promise to suppose, that the final state of happiness is not to be enjoyed without the resumption of the material body. But upon any supposition the passage proves an immediate resuscitation to conscious happiness; and it will abundantly appear in the next Section, that even they who tarry longest in the intermediate state, do not terminate their sojourn there by resuming their material bodies.

But the parable of the rich man and Lazarus is so positive, that it, alone, is amply sufficient to establish the fact of man's resurrection in a spiritual but substantial body, with capacities for the fullest sense of either happiness or misery, either delight or punishment, immediately after death. "The beggar died, and was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom: The rich man also died and was buried. And in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, Father Abraham have mercy on me, and send Lazarus that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame. And Abraham said," &c.‡ Here all parties are spoken of as being still men, and as having the members and functions of men. Notice is taken of Abraham's *bosom*, of the rich man's *tongue*, and of Lazarus's *finger*. Abraham and the rich man hold a conversation. The rich man is represented as suffering the extreme of torment, and Abraham and Lazarus as enjoying perfect happiness. And all this is described as oc-

* Luke xxiii 43.

† Rev. ii. 7.

‡ Luke xvi. 22, to the end.

curing immediately on the death of the rich man and Lazarus ; to place which beyond all doubt, — to prevent the possibility of supposing that the narrative relates to a state which they were to experience after resuming their bodies, — the rich man is made to speak of his brethren *still living in the natural world*.* No one, I suppose, will have the hardihood to say, that as the whole is a parable, and the rich man and Lazarus are fictitious characters, we must not apply what is said of them to real persons deceased ; for it is evident, though the rich man and Lazarus are imaginary persons, that they are representatives of whole classes of real persons, and that what is said of them is intended to make us acquainted with the real state of multitudes. As Dr. Dwight observes, “Should an objector say, that this representation is parabolical ; he will say it, only to escape from an argument which he cannot face.”† It is obvious, that the main design of the parable is, to communicate information respecting the real state of certain classes of good and wicked persons after death. The information it communicates is, that man no sooner leaves this world by death, than he finds himself living as a man complete in another, with capacities for the most acute sensibility either to delight or misery ; and further, that a particular judgment takes place upon man immediately after death. And, were it true that the material body is to have its resurrection also, it is impossible to conceive that the Divine Speaker would deliver a parable from which every one would infer such a resurrection to be needless, without introducing some precautionary words to prevent the mistake. No such precautionary words occur. While the immediate resuscitation of all that makes man a man is decisively asserted, no allusion is made to any resuscitation of that extrinsic adjunct to the man, his material body. Who, then, but must conclude, from this divine relation, that his material body is never to be attached to him again ?

To refer to a similar example. The Apostle John when caught up to heaven,‡ “ beheld a great multitude which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and peoples, and tongues, standing before the throne and before the Lamb, clothed in white robes, with palms in their hands,”§ uniting with the angels in their everlasting song of praise. The Apostle asked who these persons were. The interpreting angel informed him, that they were “those who came out of great tribulation, and had washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. “Therefore,” the angel adds, “they are before the throne of God, and serve him day and

* Ver. 28.

† Rev. iv. 1, 2.

‡ Theol. Serm. 164.

§ Ch. vii. 9.

right in the temple: and he that sitteth on the throne shall dwell amongst them. They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more; neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat. For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters: and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.”* None can question that these were men departed out of the natural world; nor that the time referred to is long antecedent to the expected resurrection of the material body. Yet we find them existing *as men* consequently *in a body*—necessarily a spiritual one,—and in the enjoyment of angelic bliss as exquisite as can be conceived. Can it be imagined that the resumption of their bodies of clay could make any improvement in the enjoyments of these happy beings? Does not such a thought immediately bring a cloud over the delightful scene, and shut the glorious vision from our view? Can we conceive it possible that these blessed spirits, who have their residence, it is declared immediately before the throne of God, whilst he that sitteth on the throne dwelleth among them, can at any future period withdraw from this exalted station, for the sake of re-collecting the particles of that “dust,” which, as Solomon well knew, must permanently “return to the earth *as it was*,” when “the spirit shall return to God who gave it?”†

Indeed, as the candid theologian last quoted, observes, “The manner in which God has exhibited his views concerning our bodies is in no measure calculated to raise them in our estimation. He formed them out of the earth. He made them so frail as to be subject to accident, pain, and disease in ten thousand forms. At death, he returns them to earth again. *This is their final end.* ‘Flesh and blood will not inherit the kingdom of God.‡’”

Another example, consisting in as plain unparabolic a fact as is anywhere recorded in Scripture, is this: “Two *men*, which were *Moses* and *Elias*, who appeared in glory,”§ conversed with the Lord at his transfiguration. It has been proved above, that neither of them had taken his body with him to heaven; nor did they now come to resume it: yet here they were, the well known *men*, *Moses* and *Elias*.

I will here add another observation on a passage slightly noticed above,|| the Lord’s answer to the Sadducees: the precise force of which seems generally to have been overlooked. He finishes the debate with them by saying, “Have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?”

* Ver. 14 — 17.

† Eccl. xii. 7.

‡ Dwight, *ubi supra*.

§ Luke ix. 30, 31.

|| Part 1. of this Section, pp. 44, 45.

God is not the God of the dead but of the living.”* As the learned Hody, whose “Resurrection of the Same Body Asserted” I have often quoted, and whose candor I have before had occasion to commend, here remarks, “The most that this argument proves, is, the immortality of the soul—that the souls of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob did not die with their bodies, as the Sadducees believed.” But let it be well observed, that the question in debate between the Lord Jesus Christ and the Sadducees was, *the resurrection*. It is introduced by the statement, “The same day came to him the Sadducees, which say there is no *resurrection*.”† They conclude their inquiry respecting the woman who had had seven husbands, by asking, “Therefore *in the resurrection*, whose wife shall she be of the seven?”‡ As the question had thus been put respecting *the resurrection*, it is respecting *the resurrection* that Jesus shapes his answers: “*In the resurrection*,” he says, “they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven.”§ And finally, to make his answer as full and decisive as possible, and to clear his meaning from all ambiguity, he applies his argument respecting the continued existence of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, to prove, not, simply, *the resurrection*, but explicitly, *the resurrection of the dead*: for thus he introduces it: “But as touching *the resurrection of the dead*; have ye not read,” &c.|| How is this to be evaded? Jesus proves *the resurrection of the dead*, by proving, that *the spirits* of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, were then living: Is not this completely demonstrative, that, in the idea of its Divine Author, ‘*the resurrection of the dead*,’ has no reference whatever to a *resuscitation of dead bodies*,—that the only resurrection of the dead ever to be experienced by man, is that of which Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, have long since been the subjects? And must we not everywhere understand the phrase in the same sense as is here undeniably given it by the Lord Jesus Christ himself.

The Greek word for *resurrection*, in the foregoing passage, as in every other instance but one, is *anastasis*; on which subject I will here introduce, from my *Strictures* on an adversary’s pamphlet, in the *Intellectual Repository*, the following observations, especially as they include a valuable quotation on the text just considered.

“It is to be remembered, that the New Testament was neither written in English nor in Latin, but in Greek; whence the common meaning of a word in the English or Latin translations is not always precisely that of the original. The word

* Matt. xxii. 31, 32.

† Ver. 28.

‡ Ver. 28.

§ Ver. 30.

|| Ver. 34.

in the Greek, rendered 'resurrection,' is *anastasis*, and the two words, rendered to 'rise again,' to 'raise,' and to 'rise' are *anistemi* and *egeiro*. *Egeiro* is the only verb employed on the subject in the famous chapter xv. 1 Cor. and none can pretend that this signifies, to rise *again*. Its meaning is precisely the same as that of the Latin word *surgo*, which is formed from it. *Anastasis* and *anistemi* are compounded of the particle *ana*, with *stasis* and *istemi*. *Ana*, in composition, according to the learned Schleusner, denotes, 1. *upwards*; 2. *again*; 3. *separation*; 4. only renders the word to which it is joined more emphatic; 5. adds no meaning at all. *Istemi* simply means *to stand*; and *stasis* is its corresponding substantive. This alone is sufficient to demonstrate, that the compounds, *ana-istemi* and *ana-stasis*, cannot mean to rise *again*, and a rising *again*. If the particle *ana*, in those words, had the meaning of *again*, the meaning of the words so compounded, would be to *stand* again, and a *standing* again; but the particle *ana* having its meaning of *upwards*, the words properly mean to stand *up*, and a standing *up*, that is to *rise*, and a *rising*. He who, from being in a recumbent posture, stands up, *rises*; and hence, in its secondary sense, the word means, simply, *to rise*; the same as *egeiro*, which is used indifferently with it, in reference to what is called in English the *resurrection*. *Anistemi* is the word used in Matt. xxii. 24, where our translation gives it, 'and *raise up* seed unto his brother;' in ch. ix. 9; 'And he *arose* and followed him;' in Mark iii. 26: 'And if Satan *rise up* against himself;' in ch. x. 1: 'And he *arose* from thence;' in Acts vii. 18: 'Till another king *arose*. It is quite clear, in all these places, and in numerous others that might be cited, that no meaning of *again* is included. *Anastasis*, being the noun corresponding to the verb *anistemi*, has, as a noun, the same meanings, and thus does not properly mean a rising *again*: but as it is never used in the New Testament but to denote the state after death, and entrance into it, this could only be proved by an examination of those passages. Take, however, the explanation of it, as given by one who had carefully made that examination, the celebrated orthodox American Professor of Divinity, Dr. Dwight, connected with his observations on the text respecting Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

"In his sermon on the Resurrection, after observing that the subject treated of by Paul in 1 Cor. xv. is the *Anastasis*, or future existence of man, Dr. Dwight proceeds thus: 'This word is commonly, but often erroneously, rendered *resurrection*. So far as I have observed, it usually denotes our *existence beyond the grave*. Its original and literal meaning is, to *stand up*, or *stand again*.* As standing is the appropriate posture of life,

* We have just seen that its strictly literal meaning is to *stand up*, but not to *stand again*; which, in fact, is nonsense.

consciousness, and *activity*, and lying down the appropriate posture of the *dead*, the *unconscious*, and the *inactive*, this word is not unnaturally employed to denote the future state of spirits, who are living, conscious, and active beings. Many passages of Scripture would have been rendered more intelligible, and the thoughts contained in them more just and impressive, had this word been translated agreeably to its real meaning. This observation will be sufficiently illustrated by a recurrence to that remarkable passage which contains the dispute between our Saviour and the Sadducees. 'Then came unto him,' says the evangelist, 'the Sadducees, who say there is no resurrection,'—*me einai anastasin*,—that there is no *future state*, or no future existence of mankind.—They declare seven brothers to have married successively one wife, who survived them all. They then ask, 'whose wife shall she be *in* the resurrection,'—*en te anastasei*,—in the *future state*? — Our Saviour answers, 'in the *resurrection*,' or as it should be rendered, 'In the *future state*, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven. But as touching the *resurrection of the dead*, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God,' or, as it ought to be rendered, 'Have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, concerning the future *existence of those who are dead*, saying, I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead but of the living.' This passage [continues Dr. Dwight], were we at any loss concerning the meaning of the word *anastasis*, determines it beyond dispute. The proof that there is an *anastasis* of the dead alleged by our Saviour, is the declaration of God to Moses, 'I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob;' and the irresistible truth, that 'God is not the God of the dead but of the living. The consequence, as every one who reads the Bible knows, is, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were living at the time when this declaration was made. Those who die, therefore, live after they are dead; and this future life is the *anastasis*; which is proved by our Saviour in this passage, and which is *universally denoted by this term throughout the New Testament*. Nothing is more evident than that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob had not risen from the dead [as to their material bodies], and that the declaration concerning them is no proof of the resurrection [of the body]. But it is certain they are living beings; and therefore this passage is a complete proof that mankind live after death.'

"That the word *anastasis* cannot possibly mean, in Scripture, the *resurrection of the body*, Dr. Dwight has here most conclusively proved. He also regards the English or Latin word,

resurrection, as only suitable to the *resurrection of the body*; and this was a doctrine which he was not altogether willing to give up. Is there any word, expressive of *resurrection in this* sense, to be found in the Scriptures? Yes, says Dr. Dwight: the proper word for *resurrection* is *egersis*. We should have no objection if this could be proved; for it would then be proved also, that no one ever experienced a *resurrection*, — that is, a *resurrection of the body*, — but the Lord Jesus Christ. For this word occurs but once in all the New Testament; and that is in Matt. xxvii. 53, where the resurrection spoken of is that of the Lord; and most true it is that none ever experienced, or will experience, a resurrection to eternal life of *the body*, but he alone. However, this word literally means no more than *rising*, — not *resurrection*, or *rising again*. It is the noun corresponding to, and formed from, the verb *egeiro*, the meaning of which as denoting simply *to rise*, has been already shown. Dr. Dwight's endeavor to attach the notion of *rising again* to the noun *egersis*, is a singular example of the inconsistencies into which learned men may be led by attachment to a pre-conceived system. *Egersis*, he says, means *rising again*, or that of *the body*. But this word, being merely the verb *egeiro* formed as a noun, cannot mean any more than that does. Now *egeiro*, as noticed above, is the only verb used by the Apostle, when treating so largely of the resurrection, in the fifteenth of 1st Cor. But Dr. Dwight, as already noticed, had just before been showing that the subject of that chapter is not the *resurrection* or *rising again of the body*, but the *anastasis* or the *future existence of man*!

“The truth is, that it has fared with the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, as with that of the destruction of the world at the Lord's second coming, and many other long-cherished tenets. Learned men are continually discovering, first that one, and then that another, of the passages on which those doctrines have been built, have nothing to do with the subject: and yet, from habit and prejudice, men continue to cleave to the notions, long after their supports have all been found rotten.”

I may now, I humbly hope, appeal to all the Reflecting, and ask, Whether the doctrine which they who humbly trust that they belong to the New Church of the Lord, signified, in the Revelation, by the New Jerusalem, hold upon the subject of the Resurrection, is not that of the whole Bible? We have found, upon an extensive review of the passages commonly relied on for the proof of the resurrection of the body, that not one of them affords any real countenance to such a notion, but that many of them prove decidedly the reverse: we have found that

the passages which assert man's immediate resurrection, and which assign to him, in the resurrection, a spiritual body, in which he exists as a real substantial man, and becomes a subject either of final happiness or misery, are numerous, unequivocal, and perfectly conclusive : and, finally, we have ascertained, that the phrase, *the resurrection of the dead*, means such a resurrection as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, experienced immediately after death. Thus the doctrine of the Scriptures upon this momentous subject is clearly that which we have embraced, as the doctrine of the New Jerusalem : if then the Scriptures are to decide the question, it appears to us, that our doctrine upon this subject is impregnably established.

Let us now ask by way of conclusion, which doctrine has most moral advantages, — which is most likely to have a beneficial effect on the life and practice ; — that which defers man's final happiness or misery to an indefinite distance, and represents him as without capacities for the complete sense of either, till he again becomes a man by the resumption of his dust after a lapse of still, probably, many, many ages, whilst, during the intermediate period, he is a mere breath or vapor, or something still less substantial, differing but little from a non-entity ; — or that which regards him as rising again, a perfect man, as soon as he quits his clay, possessing far keener powers of perceiving either happiness or misery than he had while shrouded over with flesh, and going to meet his final doom at once ? No one, I should think, can hesitate a moment about the answer : but lest I, in giving it, should be suspected of being under the influence of prejudice, the amiable Watts shall be the respondent.

“So corrupt and perverse,” says this esteemed theologian, “are the inclinations of men in this fallen and degenerate world, and their passions are so much impressed and moved by things that are present, or just at hand, that the joys of heaven, and the sorrows of hell, when set far beyond death and the grave, at some vast and unknown distance of time, would have but too little influence on their hearts and lives. And although these solemn and important events are never so certain in themselves, yet being looked on as things a great way off, they make too feeble an impression on the conscience, and their distance is much abused to give an indulgence to present sensualities. For this we have the testimony of our blessed Saviour himself (Matt. xxiv. 48) : ‘The evil servant says, *My Lord delayeth his coming ; then he begins to smite his fellow-servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken.*’ And Solomon teaches the same (Eccl. viii. 11) : ‘*Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men, is fully set in them to do evil.*’ And even the good servants, in this im-

perfect state, the sons of virtue and piety, may be too much allured to indulge sinful negligence, and yield to temptations too easily, when the terrors of another world are set so far off, and their hope of happiness is delayed so long. Whereas, *if it can be made to appear from the Word of God, that, AT THE MOMENT OF DEATH, the soul enters into AN UNCHANGEABLE STATE, according to its character and conduct here on earth, and that the recompenses of vice and virtue are to begin immediately upon the end of our state of trial ;**—then all those little subterfuges are precluded, which mankind would form to themselves from the unknown distance of the day of recompence. Virtue will have a nearer and stronger guard placed about it, and piety will be attended with superior motives, if its rewards are near at hand, and shall commence as soon as this life expires ; and the vicious and profane will be more effectually affrighted, if the hour of death must immediately consign them to a state of perpetual sorrows and bitter anguish.” He then notices the argument, that the dead will awake out of their graves utterly ignorant of the long time that has passed since their death, wherefore men should be as careful to prepare for judgment as if they were immediately to undergo it : to which he replies, “ I grant, men should be so in all reason and justice. But such is the weakness and folly of our natures, that *men will not be so much influenced, and alarmed, by distant prospects, nor so solicitous to prepare for an event which they suppose to be so very far off, as they would FOR THE SAME EVENT, if it commences as soon as ever this mortal life expires.* The vicious man will indulge his sensualities, and lie down to sleep in death, with this comfort : ‘ I shall take my rest here for a hundred or a thousand years [or no one knows how much longer] ; and, perhaps, in all that space, my offences may be forgotten ; or something may happen that I may escape ; or, let the worst come that can come, I shall have a long sweet nap before my sorrows begin.’ Thus *the force of divine terrors is greatly enervated by this delay of punishment.*”†

Who can be insensible to the power of these weighty considerations ? And if they could be so strongly felt by a writer, who believed, nevertheless, that the body is at last to be raised again, and that all that is to be enjoyed or suffered in the meantime is but a faint foretaste of what is to be experienced afterwards ; how truly cogent do the arguments become when

* Dr. Watts, to adapt his doctrine to the common notion, here very awkwardly introduces a few words respecting what may *further* follow at the resurrection of the body, as a consideration to be *added* to the above, but which in reality greatly *subtracts* from its weight. To make his argument either consistent or efficacious must be kept in its simple form, as here.

† Works, Ed. Leeds, Vol. vii. pp. 5, 6, 7.

relieved from this neutralizing drawback, — when it is seen that the spirit of man is truly the man himself, possessing sensations immensely more acute than any that can be imparted to flesh and blood, — and when it thus is known that all the fulness, either of joy or sorrow, which is commonly supposed to follow only upon the resurrection of the body, awaits the man as soon as he enters the eternal world by death! Then the arguments of the heavenly-minded Watts become powerful indeed. It is only in connection with *our* view of the resurrection that they possess their proper weight. May we not then say, that whoever wishes to see the practice of virtue enforced and that of vice discouraged, by the strongest of all possible sanctions, must wish to see the truth of the New Jerusalem-doctrine of the Resurrection cordially acknowledged by all mankind?

SECTION IV.

THE LAST JUDGMENT.

PART I.

The Last Judgment of the Scriptures was not to be accomplished in the Natural World.

I now have to appeal to you, my Reflecting Readers, upon the subject of the Last Judgment. The views which we believe to be those of the New Jerusalem of the Apocalypse in regard to this great consummation, differ considerably, it is true, from those commonly entertained: and they also are such as, when first propounded, universally excite no small degree of surprise: yet their truth appears to be by no means difficult of proof; and I trust that it has already, in some degree, become apparent.

Respecting the General Judgment our distinguishing opinions are these two: First, *That, according to the Scriptures, the scene of the last Judgment was to be, not in the natural world, as commonly believed, but in the spiritual: and, SECONDLY, That it has there been accomplished accordingly.* Of these two propositions, the first may already have been sufficiently proved: for if it has been proved, as attempted in the last Section, that man rises from the dead, in a spiritual body, immediately on the death of the material body, and that no resurrection of the material body will ever take place, it necessarily follows, *that the*

spiritual world, into which death introduces him, *can alone be the scene of the judgment he is to experience*. But, as what passes in the spiritual world cannot be known to the inhabitants of the natural world in general; if the judgment is performed there, the inhabitants of the natural world would not have any consciousness of what was passing. Hence our second proposition, *that it has there been accomplished accordingly*, — affirms nothing that is at all improbable in itself, and nothing which can, by any possibility, be proved to be false. In this and two subsequent PARTS of this SECTION we will give further evidence in proof of our *first* proposition; after which we shall see, in PART IV., that, independently of the assertions of Swedenborg, there are various considerations tending to evince that our *second*, also, is certainly true.

But as great misrepresentations of our sentiments on the last Judgment have been diligently circulated, some notice of these must be premised.

Among the arts too often resorted to by polemic writers, it has been observed that this is one. The controvertist selects some doctrine of great importance which no one ever thought of denying: he proves with great display of authorities the certainty of such doctrine; he insinuates that its truth is denied by those whose sentiments it is wished to render odious; and then, because he has clearly proved what nobody doubts, he triumphs as if he had completely defeated the object of his attack. This is the course frequently adopted by the assailants of the New Church. As if we denied the last judgment altogether a writer introduces the subject with these remarks: “The doctrine of the Last Judgment is of high import, and is most clearly revealed in the Word of God. Nor has there ever been much controversy in the Christian world on this subject; which is a clear proof, if more than Scripture proof were wanting, that the doctrine has met with the acquiescence of all men throughout the Christian world, with the exception, now of late, of the Swedenborgians, who, I suppose wish to be called Christians.” Accordingly, to put down these wicked “Swedenborgians,” a great display of texts is made in which a judgment is asserted: including some from the “Mahometan’s Creed.” The ancient heathens, also, are brought in to condemn us. “Many,” it is gravely observed, “of the wiser heathens believed in a general judgment in some form; though their *form* might differ from that recorded in the Scripture, yet the *thing* they believed. For they could in no wise reconcile themselves to the prosperity of the vicious, and the adversity of the virtuous, which was every day before their eyes, but on the supposition of a future reckoning day, and an hereafter of rewards and

punishments.”* Now to what purpose is all this, when it never entered into the thoughts of one of those persons whom they call “Swedenborgians,” to have any shadow of doubt about the reality of “a future reckoning day, and a hereafter of rewards and punishments?” If the heathens are to be commended, because they “believed in a general judgment in some form, though their form might differ from that recorded in the Scriptures, are we to be censured, because we believe in a general judgment, in the form recorded in the Scriptures, though our form may differ from that preferred by our censurers? And because the form of the general judgment believed in by us, and taken by us from the Scriptures, differs from that preferred by our censurers, are the heathens to be called in to condemn us, as if, worse than they, we denied both the form and the thing? Indeed, scarcely any thing that has been advanced against us on this subject applies to our views in any degree whatever. Our doctrines affirm, that a particular judgment takes place, on every individual at death: he then who wishes to overthrow them, ought to prove from Scripture, that no one undergoes any particular judgment after death whatever. Our doctrines affirm, that the general judgment mentioned in scripture was to take place in the spiritual world and not in the natural, and that, agreeably to divine prediction, it has there been performed accordingly; he then who would overthrow them should prove, that the general judgment was not to take place in the spiritual world, but in the natural, and that it will not be performed till the total end and destruction of the world. None of these points has our opponent attempted to establish. All that he has advanced respecting it we fully admit, except his Mahometan proof, and his misrepresentation of our views. I will, however notice the few sentences in which this writer makes any attempt to encounter our sentiments.

After the paragraph respecting the acknowledgment by the heathens of “a future reckoning day and a hereafter of rewards and punishments,” he adds, “But I must not wrong the Swedenborgians, for they allow of a judgment; but it is a judgment on every individual soon after leaving the *material* body, and takes place in the spiritual world!” In connection with what had gone before, and marked, as it is, by the note of exclamation, this must be intended to treat such a mode of “allowing of a judgment” as nugatory and evasive,—as if it were no judgment at all: What man, however, of sound mind but must feel, that “a judgment on every individual soon after leaving the material body,” is, to every individual, an incomparably more serious affair, than a judgment to take place many hun-

* Anti-Swedenborgian, p. 54.

dreds or thousands of years hence ? The gentleman proceeds : "If it be true, as some learned men say, that, in the whole world, more than sixty persons die every minute, one minute with another ; then there can be no cessation to the work of judgment !" Another eloquent note of admiration, to call upon the reader to supply by his imagination the objection, which, the author saw, would appear utterly futile if plainly stated. For what can be the design of this sentence, with its note of admiration, but to hint, that the Divine Judge would find such a mode of judgment too troublesome and difficult ? The objector insinuates, that to judge of the case of sixty persons in a minute, is too hard for Omniscience ; wherefore, to *simplify* the matter, he would have all who died from the beginning of the world to the end of it *judged at once*. He goes on : "And if, according to their doctrine, the world will never be at an end, but will last for ever, then there must be an everlasting propagation of mankind." This is sad aggravation of the difficulty, indeed. If the human race is thus to continue, and the ratio of its increase goes on as at present, instead of only sixty dying in a minute, there will at length be six hundred or six thousand ; and then how can they be judged ? The mind of the objector is overwhelmed at the thought ; and he apprehends that the Almighty must sink under the task, as he does under the idea. Can he really mean to suggest, that "the everlasting propagation of mankind" is too much for Infinity ? Can he in fact suppose, that Infinity can be satisfied with less ? Can he behold the countless multitudes of suns which the telescope discovers to us, each accompanied, as reason necessarily concludes, with its dependent worlds ; can he admit that all these are replenished with inhabitants, and with an endless variety of natural productions, like the world in which we live ; can he believe that the minutest and the greatest of all things are alike the workmanship of the Creator ; and that his providence, throughout all worlds, is as universal as the Lord teaches when he says, that not a sparrow falls to the ground without our heavenly Father, and that the very hairs of our head are all numbered ? Can his mind embrace all this, and then shrink from the congenial idea, that He who has produced and who governs these mighty works, did not create them for the sake of uncreating them again, but, as they are boundless in extent, so are they intended to be in duration, and their Creator will continue to draft off from them inhabitants for his heavenly kingdom, in continually increasing numbers, without end ? Alas, this thought seems to distress our poor friend most of all ; for he adds, as something transcendantly monstrous, "And then again, according to this New Jerusalem doctrine, all mankind

after death become either angels in heaven or devils in hell ; wherefore, it clearly follows that this world, their doctrine being admitted, is nothing but a manufactory of angels and devils !” Most truly, it does so follow : and if the inference thus sagaciously brought out is sufficient to condemn the “New-Jerusalem doctrine,” we have not a syllable to offer in extenuation. If our opponents will have it so, “this world is nothing but a manufactory of angels and devils.” And pray, for what “manufactory,” more worthy of its Creator than that of angels, do they think it can be designed ? (as for devils, according to our doctrine, they are not *manufactured* such by the Creator, but by themselves). Do they mean to deny the fact, and affirm that mankind do not become either angels or devils ? It really is not easy to tell what they mean ; further than this ; that they are determined at any rate, to contradict the doctrines of the New Jerusalem, but cannot find any thing plausible to urge against them. The plain English of such objections is this, — that those sublime and heavenly doctrines make God too wise, too good, and too great.

Without further notice of such futile objections, I proceed to deliver *our* sentiments on the subject.

The first proposition then that I am to endeavor to establish, is, *That the general judgment announced in Scripture, as to be performed at the Second Coming of the Lord, was not to take place in the natural world, as commonly supposed, but in the spiritual.*

In this first PART of the present SECTION, we will consider, chiefly, the proofs of the fact, *That the Last Judgment of the Scriptures was not to be accomplished in the natural world ;* only deducing thence as a corollary, *That the spiritual world must be the scene of it :* in the next PART, more direct evidence shall be offered of this second branch of the Proposition.

That the Last Judgment of the Scriptures was not to take place in the natural world, is evident from this consideration : that the circumstances announced in prophecy as being to attend it, are such as cannot be designed to be literally understood, and, some of them, such as are impossible in the nature of things.

For what is the nature of the Last Judgment, according to the common apprehensions of it ; and how is it to be performed ?

I have noticed some of the supposed attendant circumstances in the preceding Section, and will now draw them out a little more at length.

We have all been told from our childhood, that angels are to appear with trumpets, the sound of which shall be so loud, as not only to rouse to a sense of the great event at hand the whole race of mankind then living upon the globe, but also to wake the dead : for then

"—— a mighty trump, one half concealed
In clouds, one half to mortal eye revealed,
Shall pour a dreadful note; the piercing call
Shall rattle in the centre of the ball,
The extended circuit of creation shake;
The living die with fear, the dead awake."*

"Or as another authority describes it,

"Celestial guards the topmost height attend,
And crowds of angels down from heaven descend;
With their big cheeks the deafening clarions wind,
Whose dreadful clangors startle all mankind:—
Ten thousand worlds revive to better skies,
And from their tombs the thronging corpses rise."†

No matter how long since they may have lain mouldering in the dust, nor how widely their particles have been scattered asunder; no matter into what other substances they may have passed; nor even though, by being devoured by cannibals, or by passing into the substances of vegetables and animals, and being thence again taken into the human system, they may have formed parts of human bodies many times over; no matter for these and a thousand difficulties more, all shall revive:

"And now from every corner of the earth,
The scattered dust is called to second birth;
Whether in mines it formed the ripening mass,
Or humbly mixed and flourished in the grass,
[Or holds the station that it held before,
In human forms incorporate o'er and o'er];
The severed body now unites again,
And kindred atoms rally into men,—
Here an imperfect form returns to light,
Not half renewed, dishonest to the sight;
Maimed of his nose appears his blotted face,
And scarce the image of a man we trace:
Here, by degrees infused, the vital ray
Gives the first motion to the panting clay:
Slow, to new life the thawing fluids creep,
And the stiff joints wake heavily from sleep."‡

This description, to be sure, exposes a little of the inconveniences of the operation; however, all shall be made complete,

"—— not the least atom
Embezzled or mislaid of the whole tale.
Each soul shall have a body ready-furnished;
And each shall have his own."§

Well may the poet add,

"Ask not how this shall be."—

And well may both poet and dogmatist seek to silence inquiry

* Young.

† Amhurst's translation of Addison's celebrated Latin poem on the Altar-piece of Magdalen College, Oxford.

‡ Amhurst's Addison.

§ Blair.

with the magic word "Omnipotence." Omnipotence shall surmount all difficulties. The whole terraqueous globe, it seems, like one huge mine, is suddenly to explode, and every spot, both of earth and sea, is to shoot out a human body :

"So when famed Cadmus sowed the fruitful field,
With pregnant throes the quickened furrow swell'd
From the warmed soil sprung up a warlike train,
And human harvests covered all the plain."*

These, however, though they appear as men complete, are as yet only men's bodies ; the souls, therefore, which formerly animated them and which have been reserved in some unknown region, are to be called from their obscure and not very comfortable retreat and united with them again :

"The body thus renewed, the conscious soul,
Which has perhaps been fluttering near the pole,
Or midst the burning planets wondering strayed,
Or hovered o'er where her pale corpse was laid ;
Or rather coasted on her final state,
And feared, or wished, for her appointed fate ;
This soul, returning with a constant flame,
Now weds forever her immortal frame."†

And notwithstanding the multitude of spirits and bodies thus seeking for each other, none shall be mismatched,

"Nor shall the conscious soul
Mistake its partner ; but amidst the crowd,
Singling its other half, into its arms
Shall rush, with all the impatience of a man
That's new come home, who having long been absent,
With haste runs over every different room,
In pain to see the whole."†

These then are all to join those who may then be living, and, forming with them an innumerable great army, are to await the decision of their lot. To complete the description :

"Ten thousand trumpets now at once advance :
Now deepest silence lulls the vast expanse :
So deep the silence, and so loud the blast,
As nature died when she had groaned her last.
Nor man nor angel moves. The Judge on high
Looks round, and with his glory fills the sky :
Then on the fatal book his hand he lays,
Which high to view supporting seraphs raise :
In solemn form the rituals are prepared,

* Amhurst's Addison.

† Young.

† Blair. See a striking delineation of this monstrous idea in Cromek's edition of Blair's "Grave" with Blake's Illustrations ; in which is a print representing the Soul as a slender female darting down from the sky, and the Body as a robust male springing out of the earth, clasping each other in their arms.

The seal is broken, and a groan is heard. —
 Aloft, the seats of bliss their pomp display,
 Brighter than brightness, this distinguished day:—
 Horrors beneath, darkness in darkness, hell
 Of hell, where torments behind torments dwell;
 A furnace formidable, deep and wide,
 O'erboiling with a mad sulphureous tide,
 Expands its jaws, most dreadful to survey,
 And roars outrageous for the destined prey. —
 Such is the scene : and one short moment's space
 Concludes the hopes and fears of human race."*

While this is proceeding, all the elements sympathize : the world takes fire ; the stars fall to the earth ; and at length all creation perishes in one universal conflagration ;

"Reverse all Nature's web shall run,
 And spotless Misrule all around,
 Order, his flying foe, confound,
 While backwards all the threads shall haste to be unspun."

"The sun, by sympathy concerned,
 At these convulsions, pangs, and agonies,
 Which on the whole creation seize,
 Is to substantial darkness turned.

The neighboring moon, as if a purple flood
 O'erflowed her tottering orb, appears
 Like a huge mass of black corrupting blood ;
 For she herself a dissolution fears."

"No more the stars, with paler beams,
 Shall tremble o'er the midnight streams,
 But travel downward, to behold
 What mimics them so twinkling there ;
 And, like Narcissus, as they gain more near,
 For the loved image straight expire,
 And agonize in warm desire,
 Or slake their heat as in the stream they roll.
 Whilst the world burns, and all the orbs below
 In their expiring ruins glow,
 They sink, and unsupported leave the skies,
 Which fall abrupt, and tell their torment in their noise."†

"This globe, alone, would but defraud the fire,
 Starve its devouring rage : the flakes aspire
 And catch the clouds, and make the heavens their prey.
 The sun, the moon, the stars, all melt away :
 All, all is lost : no monument, no sign,
 Where once so proudly blazed the gay machine.
 So bubbles on the foaming stream expire ;
 So sparks that scatter from the kindling fire.
 The devastations of one dreadful hour
 The great Creator's six-days' work devour."‡

It is thus that the Last Judgment is usually described. I

* Young.

† Pomfret.

‡ Young.

have taken my delineation of it from the poets, because it is to poetry that such ideas properly appertain: I have been careful, however not to borrow from them any circumstances of their own invention, but only such as, whether related in poetry or in prose, are generally believed to belong to the subject; and it would be easy to repeat all their statements from almost every prose-writer who has handled the theme. Of the poets, also, whom I have cited, three were clergymen, whose orthodoxy has never been disputed; and the fourth (Addison) is an author, whose authority, on such a subject, few of the clergy would reject. But who can weigh, in the balance of a cool deliberate judgment, such representations as the above, without concluding, that the facts affirmed in them are as purely poetical as the language? — in other words, that the facts are pure figures, bearing, indeed, a distinct signification, — relating to circumstances which were infallibly to come to pass, — but the true nature of which must be totally mistaken while the figurative language in which they are described is literally understood? The facts are all taken from the prophetic language of Scripture: they are the figures of inspired prophecy transferred into the works of uninspired writers; and who can seriously consider them, and advert to the manifold inconsistencies which the literal adherence to them includes, as unconsciously drawn out and dwelt upon by the writers of the above quotations, without acceding to the assertion of the illustrious Swedenborg: That men have formed such notions respecting the Last Judgment, merely because the genuine spiritual sense of the Holy Word has not heretofore been known, and the language in which it is written, which is that of the perpetual analogy or correspondence established by the Creator between spiritual things and natural has not been understood.* But why abide by the letter here, when many things are affirmed in prophecy, in connection with the above, which never are literally interpreted? No one, for instance, ever yet dreamed, that, at the time of the Last Judgment, or preparatory to it, a dragon would be seen falling from heaven, a woman in labor clothed with the sun, and a beast with seven heads and ten horns ascending out of the sea, while another with two lamb's horns rises out of the earth, as described in chs. xii., and xiii., of the Revelation: and yet it were just as reasonable to expect these phenomena then to take place, as to expect all dead carcasses to leave their graves; the Divine Judge to appear visibly in the clouds, seated on a throne there placed, with books open before him; the sun and moon to be extinguished, and the stars to fall from heaven; and the earth and visible heavens, thus the whole visible uni-

* See the masterly and profound manner in which this subject is treated by Swedenborg himself, in the first five Sections of his work '*On the Last Judgment.*'

verse, to be consumed with fire. The latter are all symbolical images as well as the former, and are only to be understood by the same rule of interpretation. In the spiritual world, indeed, where, as we shall see in the sequel, the natural objects that are seen are not real natural objects, but appearances of them, corresponding to the internal state and circumstances of the spirits and angels, and conveying to the minds of the beholders the ideas of which they are expressive ; — in that world, such appearances as are described in the prophetic language of Scripture, are doubtless seen on the occasions in connection with which they are mentioned : but in the natural world the case is quite different ; and hence the circumstances mentioned respecting the Last Judgment are not in the natural world literally to take place, and some of them are such as cannot possibly be there exhibited. It will hence follow, that it is in the spiritual world, and not in the natural, that, according to the Scriptures, the Last Judgment was to be performed. The *effects* of it, indeed, must, doubtless, be felt in the natural world also, and much that is described as accompanying it must have, in the natural world, a spiritual fulfillment : but it is in the spiritual world only that *the judgment itself* could be performed ; and in the spiritual world only that any of the circumstances predicated respecting it could literally occur.

We will, however, consider the common ideas of the Last Judgment a little further. The principal circumstances expected to attend it, beside the elevation of the good into heaven and the casting the wicked into hell, are these : 1. *The resurrection of all dead bodies* : 2. *The appearance of the Lord in the clouds* : 3. *The conflagration of the world, and the whole material universe*. These three things are essential to the performance of the Last Judgment in the manner commonly looked for : if then it can be proved that all, or any of them, will not take place, the error of the common idea of the Last Judgment is demonstrated, and it becomes certain that the natural world is not to be the scene of its performance.

1. The first of these circumstances, *The resurrection of all dead bodies*, is the great foundation, the essential basis, of the received doctrine of the Last Judgment. If the bodies of the dead be not to rise again, it is perfectly evident, that the judgment upon the deceased cannot be performed in the natural world. If then it has been proved in the last Section (as, I trust, is the fact), that there is not a single passage of Scripture which predicts any such thing as the resurrection of the body ; if it has been proved that the resurrection of the Scriptures is a rising in a spiritual body,

into a spiritual world, immediately after death; if it has been proved that it is a mistake to understand the Scripture-phrase, "the resurrection of *the dead*," as if it meant the resurrection of *the body*, since Jesus Christ himself explains it to mean no other resurrection than Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, have already experienced; then, as observed above, the common mode of expecting the Last Judgment has already been proved to be unfounded. The materials of such a judgment are gone: and, to make our ideas of the subject consistent with this fact, we must transfer our expectations of the judgment to that world, into which they who are to be judged are transferred by the resurrection.

2. The second circumstance, *The appearance of the Divine Judge in the clouds*, is also essential to the received doctrine of the Last Judgment: for the presence, in the natural world, of the Judge, is indispensable, if the parties to be judged are there assembled. If then it has been proved in our second Section* (as, I trust, was accomplished), that such a personal coming of the Lord in the elementary clouds is a thing impossible; if it has been proved, that if we understand, from the literal sense of some prophecies, that he will make his advent in the clouds, we must understand, from the literal sense of another, that he will come riding on horseback, which idea every mind at once rejects as absurd; if it has been proved that such symbolic language is intended to announce, not his coming into this world in person, but his presence in his Word of Divine Truth, imparting to the intellectual faculties of man the power of rightly understanding it, opening the clouds of the letter, and revealing the glories of its spiritual signification; then, also, the common mode of expecting the Last Judgment has already been proved to be founded in misconception. The means of executing such a judgment are taken away; and to make our ideas of the subject consistent with this fact, we must look for its performance in that world, where such a personal appearance of the Lord, and the symbolic representations which are described as attending it, are not only not impossible, but are perfectly agreeable to the laws of nature, — the nature that is, of a spiritual world, and of spiritual existences.

In addition to the inconsistencies noticed in Section II., in the place just referred to, as attendant on the doctrine of the appearance of the Lord in the clouds to judge all who ever lived on the earth, others might easily be mentioned. Thus if all

* See above pp. 26, 27, 28. For the reasons why the nature of the Lord's Second Coming, and of the Last Judgment then to be performed, has not hitherto been understood, see also above, p. 15—25.

dead bodies are to rise, they must, as observed above, be exploded from all parts of the earth and sea.

But this world is in the form of a globe, and the clouds are never more than a very few miles above its surface ; Hence, the remotest star can only be visible to half the globe at a time ; and the highest cloud can never be seen from more than a very small segment of the convex earth. In what part of the clouds, then, is the Judge to appear, so as to be visible to all the inhabitants of the globe, previously living, and *resurrected* at once ? Where, also, is the tribunal to be placed, so as to be *above* all those who are to be judged ? What is *above* to us, is *below* to the New Zealanders ; and all the inhabitants of the globe have in like manner their antipodes. If then all are to be judged together, instead of *rising*, the great majority must *fall* to the place. Is a notion like that of the rabbins to be adopted, when they affirm, that, let a Jew die where he will, he will return to life in the land of Canaan, his remains making their way thither by rolling and wriggling through certain passages provided for the purpose in the bowels of the earth ? These and similar inconsistencies seem alone sufficient to convince any one who reflects on them, that the natural world was not to be the scene of the last Judgment.

The Lord's making his Second Coming, in a spiritual manner, among the inhabitants of this world, by restoring the right apprehension of his Divine Truth, together with the life of it, and thus effecting the renovation of his church universal among men, according to the view offered in Section II., is a consequence of his accomplishing the Last Judgment in the spiritual world ; and this also he accomplishes by means of his Divine Truth, — by pouring forth the influences of his Spirit of Truth in such a manner as the wicked cannot bear. Hence, as it is more particularly in his character as the Divine Truth itself that the Lord executes judgment, he is always called, on that occasion, the Son of man ; — as when he says, that the Father “hath given him authority to execute judgment also, *because he is the Son of Man*” (John v. 27) ; for, as is mentioned above, p. 27, and is shown at large in my work on “the Plenary Inspiration of the Scriptures,” the Son of man is a title assumed by the Lord in reference to his character as the Divine Truth : and that it is to his Word, which is the same thing as the Divine Truth, that judgment belongs, he himself teaches when he says, “If any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not : for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him : *the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day*” (John xii. 47, 48). Hence we see the

harmony between the spiritual fulfillment of the predictions relating to his Second Coming to the inhabitants of this world, and the spiritual conjoined (in some respects) with the literal fulfillment of the same to the inhabitants of the spiritual world. That which is manifested is, in both worlds, the Divine Truth: but in the spiritual world the Divine Truth appears in person, for the performance of the judgment; and in the natural world the Divine Truth is revealed in the Word for the restoration of the church. These two things we understand to form a one, as do the sun and its light: for the inmost essence of the Divine Truth in the Word, and thus of the Word itself even in its literal sense, is the Divine Truth in person, that is, the Lord Himself; just as the sun is the inmost essence of all the light of day; and thus plenarily, it is, according to our ideas, that the written Word is divinely inspired. Now any one may conceive that the Divine Truth in person can only be visible to the sight of angels and spirits, and not to the natural sight of men; though men may receive in their understandings some apprehension of the Divine Truth contained in the Word, of which the Divine Truth in person is the only Source.

According to this view it will be seen, that although our doctrines deny the possibility of the Lord's visible appearance, in his Glorified Person, to men on earth, they by no means deny that his visible appearance would attend the performance of the Last Judgment. It is this appearance which is spoken of in Acts i. 10, 11; which passage at once teaches, what it is often cited to prove, that at the Lord's coming to judgment he would visibly appear, and, what is as generally overlooked, that his appearance would not be visible to the inhabitants of the world in general. After relating the Lord's ascension in the presence of the apostles, and saying that "a cloud received him out of their sight," it is added, "And while they looked steadfastly towards heaven as he went up, behold two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come, *in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.*"

Now if the coming of the Lord to judgment is to be *in like manner* as his ascension, it cannot be visible to the inhabitants of the natural world; *for none of the inhabitants of the natural world beheld his ascension*, except the eleven apostles; and these did not see it with the eye of their body, but by that of their spirit; in the manner that, according to what was shown above, the ascension of Elijah was seen by Elisha; hence, as Elisha beheld, together with his ascending master, a chariot and horses of fire, so did the apostles, when viewing the ascension of their Lord, behold also two angels; just as, at his

THE LAST JUDGMENT.

transfiguration, they had seen with him Moses and Elias; all which were spiritual beings and existences, that could not possibly be beholden with the eyes of the body. "In like manner," then, the coming of the Lord in person to judgment, could not be seen by any inhabitant of the earth, unless the eyes of his spirit were miraculously opened for that purpose; thus the declaration that he should "so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven," can only relate, in its literal sense, to his appearance to the inhabitants of the spiritual world: and thus it was them only that he was to come again to judge. For the distinct apprehension of this, it may be necessary to add, that the Lord, when his Humanity was fully glorified, ascended above all the heavens, into the highest or inmost of all things; that the scene of the judgment, as will be seen presently, is an intermediate region of the spiritual world, between heaven and hell, appropriated to the first reception of departed spirits; and that the judgment is effected by his exhibiting himself present, in a peculiar manner, in the lowest parts of heaven; in doing which he is said to descend, though he is not the less present in his supreme residence than before. For *space* in the spiritual world, which is not formed of matter, is not fixed, but is an appearance depending upon the *states* of those who are there: and in no degree can space limit the presence of the Omnipotent God.

Again then, I trust, it is evident, that the Lord's coming in the clouds, to the inhabitants of the natural world, is only possible in a spiritual manner; and that in the spiritual world only could the appearance of his doing so literally take place; consequently, that it was in the spiritual world, and not in the natural, that the Last Judgment was to be performed.

3. The third circumstance, *The conflagration of the world and the whole material universe*, belongs, in itself, less essentially than the two former, to the performance of the Last Judgment in the natural world; yet it is equally necessary to the received doctrine on the subject; because the received doctrine is drawn from the prophetic language of Scripture taken in its literal sense only; and, in the literal sense of those prophecies, the passing away of heaven and earth, the burning of the day of the Lord as an oven, the extinction of the sun and moon and the falling from heaven of the stars, are repeatedly announced. But if it has been proved (as was likewise, I trust, accomplished) in our second Section,* that by these phrases, accompanied also, as they frequently are, by the promise of a new heaven and a new earth, is constantly meant the dissolution or termination of one dispensation and the founding of a new one. — or "the putting of an entire end to one order of things.

and the commencement of a new one, either with respect to particular or to general churches ;” if it has been proved that some of the occasions in regard to which such convulsions of nature are announced have undeniably passed by, without any such outward catastrophe resulting ; if it has thus been proved that the destruction of the world and the material universe cannot, with any degree of probability, be inferred from the use of such images in the prophetic style of Scripture ; then, again, has it already been proved to be at least in the highest degree probable, that the common mode of expecting the Last Judgment is altogether erroneous. The expected consequences of such a judgment will not, we see, ensue ; the world will not, as far as can be gathered from the Scriptures, be consumed ; still less will the whole visible creation, — the countless stars, which we know to be other suns, each the centre to a system of earths, — be hurled into ruin, (monstrous idea !) to punish the iniquity of this little globe. Yet such must be the fact, if the judgment is to be performed, as expected, within the precincts of nature.

We have seen above,* that one of the sagacious refuters of our views is quite appalled at the idea of the endless duration of the world, and its shocking consequence, that “there must be an everlasting propagation of mankind.” Few besides, I apprehend, will think the idea shocking, but most, on the contrary, must regard it as grand and glorious ; yet many, perhaps, may feel surprised at its novelty ; for the belief that the world is to be destroyed is one of the earliest prejudices with which the mind is imbued ; and few ever think of afterwards calling it under the scrutiny of maturer judgment. Yet the future perpetual duration of the world appears to admit of proof, from reason and Scripture, that falls little short of demonstration.

It has been shown above,† that the passages of Scripture which seem to speak of the destruction of the world cannot have any such signification ; and that this is now, with respect to most of them, admitted by the learned in general. But the single circumstance, that the destruction of the world should be attended, as affirmed in most of the prophecies which appear to speak of it, with the falling of the stars from heaven, seems alone sufficient to convince the reader, that the dissolution of nature is not the thing intended. This idea evidently treats the stars as if they were in reality, what they appear to the unassisted senses, mere subordinate appendages to this globe of ours, performing no other use in the creation than that which they perform to us. The Scriptures assume this idea, not for the purpose of affirming it to be the fact, but because this affords a sufficient basis for that spiritual instruction which

* P. 129.

† P. 28, &c.

alone the Scriptures have for their object; and because, when they mention the stars, the stars of the firmament are never really meant: but when we rise from the seeming to the real nature of the stars of the firmament, we clearly see that it cannot be of them that the Scripture speaks, when it says, the stars shall fall from heaven. They cannot fall from heaven but by coming down to the earth, as described in the verses cited above from Pomfret. Any other mode of falling might as well be called rising, since it would only be a motion from one part of the visible heavens to another, which, if it caused them to set to one hemisphere of the globe, would cause them to rise to the opposite hemisphere: accordingly, that they are to fall *to the ground*, is the idea always attached to the expression by the simple, according to whose ideas of natural things the Word of God, in its letter, is uniformly written. While the world was believed to be the largest body in the universe, round which, as their centre, the sun and all the stars moved, the practicability of such a falling of the heavenly bodies might easily be imagined. But since the advancement of science has dispelled this illusion; since it is known that the earth is but a mere speck in comparison with the sun, whilst the millions of stars which the telescope discovers are other suns, all thousands of times larger than the earth; it becomes impossible to imagine for a moment, that these enormous bodies can ever come tumbling from the sky, and drop upon the surface of this atom of a globe. Certainly, then, it is impossible, when the Scripture speaks of the falling of the stars, that the stars of the firmament can be intended: consequently, the mention of such convulsions cannot be intended to affirm the destruction of the world and the universe.

The common reader of the Scriptures takes his expectation of the world's coming to an end, in great part, from the disciples' request of the Lord, "Tell us when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming and of *the end of the world?*" (Matt. xxiv. 3). The word, however, here translated "the world," is literally "the age," and is a term applied to express the whole continuance of any order of things. But the Lord, in his answer, uses expressions which decidedly demonstrate, that his coming to judgment was not to be accompanied with the end of the world, but that, after the judgment, the world was to remain as stable as ever, and replenished with inhabitants. For he says, to illustrate the discrimination which would be used in the execution of the judgment, "Then two shall be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other *left*. Two women shall be grinding at the mill; the one shall be taken, and the other *left*." (Ver. 40, 41). But if the world were

to perish under their feet, how could any be left? When he speaks of some who after the judgment, should be left in the world; and left too, it would appear, at their usual occupations; how can it be supposed that the world is to be destroyed? How unmeaning it would be to speak of persons being left, laboring in the field or grinding at the mill, if the world, with all its mills and fields, were to be sunk in annihilation! Nor can this proof be evaded by saying, that it only relates to those who were captured or who escaped at the siege of Jerusalem: for though some parts of the prophecy had an imperfect and typical fulfillment at the siege of Jerusalem, it is fully evident, and is generally acknowledged, that its main and final reference is to the Second Coming of the Lord and the Last Judgment: if then some of the things which had a typical fulfillment at the siege of Jerusalem were to have their final fulfillment at the time of the Last Judgment, how arbitrary and palpably forced is the interpretation, which would limit others of the same series of circumstances to the siege of Jerusalem only!

But that the biblical texts which seem to speak of the destruction of the world cannot mean any such thing, is also evident from this circumstance: that there are many others which affirm the direct contrary. Some of these I will here subjoin, with remarks.*

“ ‘One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh; but *the earth abideth forever*’ (Eccl. i. 4). ‘He that buildeth his sanctuary like high places, like *the earth which he hath established forever*.’ (Ps. lxxviii. 69). ‘Once have I sworn by my holiness, that I will not lie unto David: his seed shall endure *forever*, and his throne *as the sun* before me; it shall be established *forever* as the moon’ (Ps. lxxxix. 35, 36, 37). ‘Who laid the foundations of *the earth, that it should not be removed forever*’ (Ps. civ. 5). ‘They that trust in the Lord shall be as *mount Zion*, which cannot be removed, but *abideth forever*’ (cxxv. 1). And in Ps. cxlviii., after calling on *all created things*, and the *sun and moon* among the rest, to praise the Lord, the inspired writer adds (ver. 6), ‘He hath also *established them forever and ever; he hath made a decree which cannot pass*. The eternal duration of the world is as expressly asserted in these passages, as its destruction is in any others: thus the Scripture, in its literal sense, proves both sides of the question; consequently, it does not prove either. One of the classes of passages must be intended to be understood otherwise than the letter expresses; *which*, must be decided by other con-

* From an article furnished by me, many years ago, to “the Intellectual Repository for the New Church,” Vol. i. (first series), p. 474, &c.

siderations. We are at liberty therefore either to believe one proposition or the other, as appears most consonant to reason.

“The reasons then which induce me to believe that the world will not be destroyed, but will continue to supply new inhabitants to the eternal world forever, are principally derived from considering the true nature and attributes of the Lord our God. The very essence of the Creator is pure Divine Love.* What was the cause from which we were created? Divine Love. What was the cause from which we were redeemed? Divine Love. When from his Divine Love the Lord created the universe, the end he proposed was, the production of a race of rational beings capable of enjoying his divine mercies, out of whom he might form an angelic heaven, in the midst of which he might himself eternally reside, and communicate an eternally increasing felicity to an eternally increasing multitude of free recipient spirits; nor does the perdition of a part, by their own fault, afford any argument against the design. If then these were the ends intended by our omnipotent Maker in the creation of the world, what sort of ends could he intend in its destruction? None but such as are as opposite to Divine Love, as destruction is opposite to creation, as death is opposite to life. To commence destroyer,—to become Apollyon,—he must change his nature, and cease to be Jehovah. He must cease to take pleasure in seeing happy subjects added to his kingdom. The streams of his goodness must suddenly stop in their course. His life-giving energies must suddenly be exhausted. He must cease to be infinite in power,—he must cease to be infinite in love. Judge then which sentiment does most honor to God; that which represents him as a fickle destroyer, or that which regards him as an immutable preserver. A case may indeed be imagined, in which the world would inevitably perish, without the catastrophe being at all imputable to the divine will or agency: but this could only happen by the total extinction of all remains of a church, and the extirpation of every principle of goodness from the hearts of men; which, rendering it impossible for the heavenly influences to find admission any longer, and wholly intercepting the connection between the creature and the life-giving Creator, would cause the polluted race to sink in death, and the orb they inhabited to fall to nothing. But though, so long as man continues to enjoy free-will and to be able to abuse it, such a catastrophe must be admitted to be possible, yet it never can be probable, so long as all the energies of Providence are on the alert to prevent its occurrence: and, if we may give credit to the Divine Foreknowledge, we may rest assured that, in this globe, it will

* 1 John iv. 8, 16.

never take place; much less, in the whole visible universe. For it is abundantly declared in the Word, that a glorious church shall here be finally raised up, which shall never come to an end: consequently, the globe which is to afford to this church its ultimate seat and basis, must be of equal duration. — ‘In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom *which shall never be destroyed*: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, AND IT SHALL STAND FOR EVER.’ ”*

To this popular statement of arguments against the expected destruction of the world, I will add an extract from Swedenborg, in which he opens the deep philosophical grounds of the necessity for the world’s continuance in existence, in so clear a manner, as must, I should think, to every one who loves to look beyond the mere surface of things, afford both conviction and delight. To prove that the procreations of the human race will never cease, he lays down and illustrates these six propositions. “I. That the human race is the basis upon which heaven is founded. II. That the human race is the seminary of heaven. III. That the extent of heaven designed for angels is so immense, that it cannot be filled to eternity. IV. That they of whom heaven consists, are, as yet, respectively, but few. V. That the perfection of heaven increases according to the number of its inhabitants. VI. That every divine work has respect to what is infinite and eternal.” — In illustrating the first proposition he makes these remarks: —

“That the human race is the basis upon which heaven is founded, follows from this circumstance: that man was the last object created; and that which is created last, is the basis of all that precede it. Creation began from things supreme or inmost, because from the Divine Being, and proceeded to things ultimate or extreme, and then it first came into subsistence. The ultimate, that is, the last or lowest part of the creation, is the natural universe, in which is the terraqueous globe with all its contents. When these works were produced, then man was created, and into him were collated all things of Divine Order from first to last; into his inmost parts were collated those things which are in the first principles of that order, and into his last or ultimate parts those which are in the last or ultimate principles of that order. Thus man was made divine order in a substantial form. Hence all things that are in or with man, are either from heaven or from the world; from heaven are all things belonging to his mind, and from the world all things belonging to his body: for the things of heaven flow

* Dan. ii. 44.

into his thoughts and affections, and produce them, according as themselves are received by his spirit; and the things of the world flow into his sensations and corporeal pleasures, and produce them, according as themselves are received by his body, but in an accommodated manner, according to their agreement with the thoughts and affections of his spirit. Such being the order of creation, it may be evident, that there is such an inseparable connection of all things belonging to that order, from the first to the last, that, viewed together, they constitute a one, in which that which is prior cannot be separated from that which is posterior, as the cause cannot be separated from its effect: consequently the spiritual world cannot be separated from the natural world, nor this from that; and thus the angelic heaven cannot be separated from the human race, nor the human race from the angelic heaven; wherefore it is provided by the Lord, that they should be mutually useful to each other, the angelic heaven to the human race, and the human race to the angelic heaven. Hence the angelic abodes are indeed in heaven, separate, as to sight, from the abodes of men, but still they are with man, in his affections of goodness and truth." This the author confirms by several texts of Scripture, and by various remarks; after which he proceeds to say, "Hence it is evident, that there is such a connection between the angelic heaven and the human race, that the one subsists from the other; and that the angelic heaven without the human race would be in the situation of a house without a foundation, for heaven terminates in the human race, and reposes on it. The case in this respect resembles that of a man individually: his spiritual things, which are those of his thought and will, flow into his natural things, which are those of his sensations and actions, and there terminate and subsist. Did not man possess the latter also; or were he destitute of these bounds or ultimates, his spiritual things, which are those of the thoughts or affections of his spirit, would flow off, as things without a termination or without a bottom. The case is similar when man passes out of the natural world into the spiritual, which takes place when he dies: being then a spirit, he no longer subsists upon his own individual basis, but upon the common basis, which is the human race. — Hence it may appear that the human race and the angelic heaven form a one, and owe their subsistence, mutually and reciprocally, to each other; wherefore the one cannot be taken away from the other."*

I know not how the above extract may recommend itself to the reader; but to me it appears to contain more solid knowledge respecting the nature of man and the economy of the uni-

* Last Judgment. n. 9.

verse than is to be found in any other writer ; and to be quite irrefutable. If so, the notion of the conflagration of the world and of the universe must be utterly chimerical ; as also, I think, appears conclusively from our preceding observations.

Thus, the accompaniments expected to attend the Last Judgment, if performed in the natural world, all utterly failing, again are we driven out of nature to look for it, and compelled to acknowledge, that the destined scene of its performance was not the natural but the spiritual world.

SECTION IV.

THE LAST JUDGMENT.

PART II.

The Spiritual World the Scene of it ; as of all former General Judgments.

That branch of our first Proposition which affirms, “ *That the General Judgment announced in Scripture as to be performed at the Second Coming of the Lord, was not to take place in the natural world,*” may now, it is hoped, have been proved to the satisfaction of the reflecting mind ; for we have seen as proposed, “ That the circumstances announced in prophecy as being to attend it, are such as cannot be intended to be literally understood, and, some of them, such as are impossible in the nature of things.” Other texts also, we have seen, as explicitly affirm the contrary ; while Reason has much to offer in support of their testimony. The other part of the Proposition, — “ *That the Last Judgment was to be performed in the spiritual world,*” — follows then of course, as also has been seen. This, however, may be confirmed by other considerations.

What then if it should be true, that although the General Judgment predicted in the New Testament is properly called the Last Judgment, because it is the last General Judgment ever to be performed on the natives of this earth, it is not the first such Judgment ever accomplished (as, indeed, its very name seems to imply) ; but, on the contrary, two or three general judgments have taken place before ? If the Last Judgment was not to be performed at *the end of the world*, but, as shown above, at *the end of the age* ; and if “ the age,” as shown also, denotes the whole duration of a certain order of things as

regards the dispensation of God to man ; then, as it is certain that there have been, since the beginning of the world, several such ages and dispensations, it will be reasonable to conclude, that the end of each of the former of them, like the end of the last, was attended with a General Judgment upon those who lived under it. Accordingly, the Scripture clearly teaches, how much soever its testimony upon this subject may generally have been overlooked, that such is the fact. As it prophetically announces that the last age and dispensation ever to come to its end or consummation would then be attended with a General Judgment, so does it historically record, that each of the former of such ages and dispensations was attended at its end by a General Judgment. Its testimony to this effect, therefore, we will briefly notice.

That, from the beginning of the world, the specific connection of its inhabitants with their Divine Parent has been regulated by four different dispensations, and they have been bound to him by four distinct covenants, the human subjects of which may be regarded as composing four general churches, is universally known. Adam and his posterity to the flood, lived under one dispensation : God then “ established his covenant with Noah and his seed after him : ” * another covenant was made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and their descendants, † of which the laws were given by Moses : and finally, “ grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. ” ‡ It is also known, that the first three of these dispensations were entirely corrupted, and the covenants broken, by those to whom they were given, among whom the churches thus formed in consequence perished : and that the case would be the same with the fourth dispensation and covenant, is predicted through a great part of the Apocalypse, and by the Lord in person in Matt. xxiv., and, summarily, in that question of his which supposes a negative answer, “ Nevertheless, when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth ? ” §

The language in which the judgment upon the three former of these churches is described, being of the same symbolic kind as that in which the judgment upon the last is predicted, it has not been generally understood to relate to any transaction in the spiritual world, but has been confined to the calamities with which, in the natural world, the apostate members of those churches were at length overtaken ; and yet, that the descriptions refer to judgments in the spiritual world also, may easily be inferred. Thus, as has already been seen, the passing away of heaven and earth, and convulsions in the heavenly bodies equiva-

* Gen. ix. 9.

† John i. 18.

‡ Gen. xvii. 7, 19.

§ Luke xviii. 8.

lent thereto, are constantly predicated in reference to the Last Judgment, and to the coming of the Lord for its performance : and these are predicated, not only in reference to the judgment which the Christian world is still expecting, but to the judgments on each of the former churches. The Apostle Peter, for instance, informs us, that the same sort of catastrophe as is described by the prophets under the figure of the conflagration of heaven and earth, is described by Moses under the figure of a flood : he says, “ By the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth, standing out of the water, and in the water ; whereby the world that then was, being overflowed by water, perished : but the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word, are kept in store, reserved unto fire, against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.”* We find then, that as the destruction of heaven and earth by fire is one of the forms by which the Last General Judgment is described, so the destruction of the world that then was by a flood is the form by which the General Judgment upon the Adamic Church is described : if then the Last General Judgment was not to consist solely, nor at all, in the conflagration of the visible universe, but in a judgment upon those who had passed out of the natural into the spiritual world, the judgment upon the members of the Adamic Church did not consist solely, and probably not at all,† in a flood of material waters, but in a judgment upon those who had passed from the material into the spiritual world.

The Noetic Church did not long continue as one : “ in the days of Peleg was the earth divided :”‡ and, being scattered at Babel, they no longer continued to be “ of one language and of one speech,”§ — that is, they split into different forms of worship and doctrine ; and all the ancient nations mentioned in the Old Testament were various branches of this church. Hence it does not appear that there was any General Judgment upon the whole together, till the Lord came into the world, and performed the judgment on the Jewish Church ; which itself sprung out of the Noetic Church, and most of the constitutions of which, as is well known, were selected from those which had previously been in use : but specific judgments

* 2 Pet. iii. 5, 6, 7.

† That the first eleven chapters of Genesis do not contain an exact detail of natural events, but a history of the spiritual state of mankind in those ages, couched in the language of allegory, being the only style in use among the people whose history it describes ; and that literally true history begins with the account of Abraham ; may be seen fully established in “ the Plenary Inspiration.” &c. pp. 555 — 576.

‡ Gen. x. 25.

§ Gen. ix. 1.

upon various branches of it are mentioned in several parts of the Old Testament. Thus Sodom was destroyed by fire from heaven ; and under this fact, performed in the natural world, was doubtless represented a judgment in the spiritual world, upon all of the same character who had passed into that world by death.

But, not to dwell upon the judgments of those more ancient churches ; it will be sufficient for our present argument if it can be shown, that the Lord himself performed a Judgment, while in the world, of the same nature as the Last Judgment, which he then also prophetically declared that he would, at his Second Coming, accomplish. To such a judgment, many of the prophets of the Old Testament clearly refer. Their predictions respecting the Coming of the Lord into the world, are frequently connected with the announcement of a judgment then to be performed by him. They even represent the execution of such a judgment as inseparable from that work of redemption which all acknowledge that he came to accomplish ; for without the removal thereby of evil spirits from the immediate influence which they then exercised upon the world, there could have been no salvation for the human race. Not to make an important assertion without proving it, I offer the following as a few samples of the predictions, in the Old Testament, of a judgment to be performed by the Lord at his advent in the flesh.

To what else can these words of Isaiah be worthily referred ? “ Behold the day of the Lord cometh, cruel both with wrath and fierce anger, to lay the land desolate : and he shall destroy the sinners thereof out of it. For the stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light : the sun shall be darkened in his going forth, and the moon shall not cause her light to shine. And I will punish the world for their evil, and the wicked for their iniquity ; and I will cause the arrogancy of the proud to cease ; and will lay low the haughtiness of the terrible. I will make a man more precious than fine gold, even a man than the golden wedge of Ophir. Therefore I will shake the heavens, and the earth shall remove out of her place, in the wrath of the Lord of hosts, and in the day of his fierce anger.”* Now though this in its literal sense, refers to the destruction of Babylon, who can doubt that it refers also to the destruction, at the judgment to be performed by the Lord at his coming into the world, of those who are spiritually meant by Babylon throughout the Word of God, — that is, of those who profane religion by applying its sanctities to the purpose of self-exaltation ? Hence it is said of Babylon personified under

* Isa. xiii. 9 — 13.

the name of Lucifer, in the next chapter, "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cast down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations!" — words which as the whole context shows, are not spoken of any casting down of Lucifer *then past*, but of an event *then to come*, and which the ruin of the Babylonian empire, which also did not happen till two hundred years after the delivery of this prophecy, was a type. "Behold your God *will come with vengeance*, even with God with a recompense: he *will come and save you*."* Here the judgment to be performed by the Lord when in the world is spoken of, as necessary to the salvation of the human race. "The spirit of the Lord is upon me; because the Lord hath sent me *to preach good tidings* unto the meek, &c., to proclaim *the acceptable year* of the Lord, and *the day of vengeance* of our God."† In these words, the day of salvation is announced as accompanied by the day of judgment: and of this prophecy the Lord himself said while in the world, "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears."‡ "For the *day of vengeance* is in my heart, and the *year of my redeemed* is come. And I looked, and there was none to help, and I wondered that there was none to uphold: therefore mine own arm brought salvation to me, and my fury, it upheld me. And I will tread down the people in mine anger, and make them drunk in my fury; and I will bring down their strength to the earth."§ Here again is the salvation to be wrought by the Lord's coming into the world connected with a judgment to be performed at the same time. "Behold, I judge between cattle and cattle, between the rams and the he-goats."|| This whole chapter treats of the salvation to be procured by the Lord when he should appear in the world in the character of the *good shepherd*; and the judgment then to be performed is in these words briefly described under the same image of separating between the sheep and the goats, as is so beautifully amplified in the description of the Last Judgment in Matt xxv. "Wait ye upon me, saith the Lord, until the day that I rise up to the prey: for my determination is to gather the nations, that I may assemble the kingdoms, to pour upon them mine indignation, even all my fierce anger: for *all the earth shall be devoured with the fire of my jealousy*. For then *will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may call upon the name of the Lord, to serve him with one consent*."¶ Here is a plain prediction of a General Judgment, described with the symbolic accompaniment of the burning of the earth, immediately to precede the establishment of the Christian religion. "I

* Ch. xxxv. 4.

† Ch. lii. 1, 2.

‡ Luke iv. 21.

§ Ch. lxiii. 4, 5, 6.

|| Ezek. xxxiv. 17.

¶ Zeph. iii. 8.

will show wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of the Lord come.”* Here is a description of the day of judgment with the usual adjuncts; and this prophecy is declared by Peter (Acts ii. 16) to have been *at that time* fulfilled. But who may abide the day of his coming, and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner’s fire, and like fuller’s soap. And I will come near to you to judgment. For behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be as stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it leave them neither root nor branch. Behold I send you Elijah the prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord.”† Here is a sufficiently plain announcement of *a day of judgment*, in predictions applied by the evangelists, and by the Lord Jesus Christ, *to himself while in the world*. “For he cometh, for he cometh to judge the earth: he shall judge the world with righteousness, and the people with his truth. Clouds and darkness are round about him; righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne: his lightnings enlightened the world; the earth saw and trembled: the hills melted like wax at the presence of the Lord, at the presence of the Lord of the whole earth: the heavens declare his righteousness, and all the people see his glory. For he cometh to judge the earth: with righteousness shall he judge the world, and the people with equity.”‡ A work of judgment is here clearly announced, and depicted with abundance of the appropriate figures; and these three Psalms plainly treat of the Lord’s coming into the world, and of the salvation which, by his works of judgment, he would procure for mankind.

Many similar passages might be adduced; but these may suffice to show, that, according to the prophecies of the Old Testament, the advent of the Lord in the flesh was to be accompanied with the performance of a General Judgment. But do we find, in the New Testament, any plain intimation that such a judgment was performed accordingly? This question may be most decidedly answered in the affirmative. The New Testament repeatedly notices, as just remarked, the fulfillment of predictions in which the coming of the Lord to redeem mankind is connected with the execution of a judgment: and it presents, besides, other independent testimonies to the same truth.

* Joel ii. 30, 31.

† Mal. iii. 2—5; iv. 1—5.

‡ Ps. xcvi. 13; xcvii. 2—6; xcvi. 9.

Thus when John the Baptist announces that he was the forerunner of one who was greater than himself, he speaks also of him whom he preceded as coming in the character of a Judge; "He that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire: whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire."* What plainer description of a General Judgment can there be than this? It is in fact described under nearly the same images as the Lord uses, in several of his parables, for delineating the last Judgment generally looked for by Christians. Thus, he concludes the parable of the wheat and the tares with this declaration: "In the time of the harvest, I will say unto the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn."† This the Divine Speaker himself explains to be a figurative description of the Last Judgment still generally expected; "The good seed," he says, "are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one: — the harvest is *the consummation of the age*: — as therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be at the consummation of the age. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father."‡ Now the only difference between this parable and the saying above quoted of John, is, that, in the parable, the wicked are compared to *tares*, and by the Baptist to *chaff*: in other respects, the figures used are the same. In both, the good are compared to *wheat*: in both, the taking of the good into heaven is called *the gathering of the wheat into the Lord's garner or barn*: in both, the casting of the wicked into hell is called *burning the chaff, or tares, with fire*. Jesus says that this work should be performed at the consummation of the age, or at the close of the dispensation of divine things then commencing; accordingly, all allow that the parable relates to the Last Judgment: but John says that Jesus, of whom he was speaking, *had his fan in his hand*, to make the requisite separation, *then*: Is it not then demonstrably evident, that such a judgment as the Scripture predicts at what is commonly called *the end of the world*, or at the consummation of the dispensation then commencing, is affirmed by the Scripture to have been actually wrought while the Lord was in the world; — that time being

* Matt. iii. 11, 12.

† Ch. xiii. 30.

‡ Ver. 38—43.

also *the end of the world, or the consummation of the age*, to the Jewish Church, and to the whole remains of the Noetic Church likewise? If the Scripture affirms that a General Judgment was *to be* performed by the Lord at his second coming in the spirit, it affirms, with equal positiveness, that a General Judgment *was* performed at his first coming in the flesh. The one rests upon the same authority as the other; and if we deny one, we must deny both.

But not only does John the Baptist announce, that He before whom he was sent was coming to perform a work of judgment; but the Lord Jesus Christ repeatedly declares the same thing: "The Father" saith he, "judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son;—And hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man."* Is this supposed only to mean, that a sort of judgment was then to be passed upon the Jews in this world, the destruction of whom, as a nation, did speedily follow? This interpretation of the words is guarded against by its being added, "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation."† These words relate, not to any resurrection of the body,‡ but to certain operations, attendant upon the judgment, in the spiritual world, which he was then about to perform, while, as to his natural body he was yet in the natural world: hence, he speaks of it as being just about to take place—"the hour is coming;"—and to prevent any from imagining, nevertheless, that it was a distant judgment of which he was speaking, he makes the declaration more explicit still two or three verses previously: for he there says, "Verily, verily, I say unto you The hour is coming, and *now is*, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God."§ Plainly enough, then, the whole passage relates to a judgment he was then about performing: and it is here described, in such figures as are often used when this subject is treated of, as a resurrection of the good to life eternal, and of the wicked to damnation.||

But if we were to dwell particularly on all the passages in which the Lord himself speaks of the judgment which he was engaged in performing, in the spiritual world, at the same time that, as to his natural humanity, he appeared in the world of

* John v. 22—27.

† Ver. 28, 29.

‡ As has been shown above, pp. 56—59.

§ Ver. 25.

|| See this view of the above texts fully substantiated in my 'Strictures,' &c. Int. Repository for Nov. 1835, pp. 658—668.

nature, this discussion would be protracted to a great length : I will therefore only mention, very briefly one or two more. We find him, then, in another place, saying, "For judgment am I come into this world."* And again, most explicitly, "Now is the judgment of this world : now shall the prince of this world be cast out."† It is acknowledged by all, that by the prince of this world is in Scripture meant the devil. Now it is very remarkable, that a casting out of Satan is elsewhere spoken of when the subject is respecting a General Judgment. Thus in reference to this very judgment performed by the Lord while in the world, the prophet speaks of the falling of Lucifer from heaven.‡ To the same effect, in reference to the Last Judgment generally believed to be yet future. John the Revelator declares, that he saw a great dragon cast out of heaven, and he explains this dragon to be that old serpent, called the devil and Satan.§ Just in the same manner the Lord says in Luke, when the disciples returned and told him that even the devils were subject unto them through his name, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven."|| Evidently then, the circumstance described as the falling of Satan from heaven, is a thing essentially belonging to the performance of a General Judgment. Then put these facts together. John the Revelator says that such an occurrence *would* take place *at the last judgment of all* : Isaiah announced that it would take place *at the judgment to be performed by the Lord while in the world* : and Jesus himself twice declares, that it *did then actually happen* : how then is it possible to retain any doubt, that the Lord Jesus Christ was actually engaged in performing a judgment in the spiritual world, while, as to his assumed human nature, he was personally present in this ?

Both parts — the latter as well as the former, — of our first proposition, may now, I trust appear sufficiently established ; —namely, That the General Judgment announced in Scripture as to be performed at the Second Coming of the Lord, was not to take place in the natural world, as commonly supposed, but in the spiritual. If the Last Judgment announced in the New Testament be not the only General Judgment ever accomplished on the natives of this earth, but, on the contrary, there have been two or three such before ; then, doubtless, this would be executed in the same manner as those. It is certain that, at former judgments, particularly at the most indisputable of them, that performed by the Lord while in the world, there was no gathering together, in this world, of all who had previously

* Ch. ix. 39.

† Ch. xii. 31.

‡ Isa. xiv. 12. See above, p. 145.

§ Rev. xii. 9.

|| Luke x. 18.

died, no appearing of the Judge in the clouds, and no destruction of the globe and of the visible universe : consequently, neither were such events to occur at the Last Judgment of all. All former General Judgments were executed in the spiritual world : consequently, that world must be the scene of the Last Judgment also.

SECTION IV.

THE LAST JUDGMENT.

PART III.

An Intermediate World and State the specific Scene of all General and Particular Judgments.

The specific argument of the preceeding PART of this SECTION,—That the Last Judgment was to be performed in the spiritual world, because there is evidence, that, though the last, it is not the first General Judgment on the natives of this globe, and that all former General Judgments have been performed in that world,—will be strongly corroborated if it can be shown, in what specific region of the spiritual world such an operation could be performed ; and that the existence of such a region, and of the execution in it of at least one former General Judgment, is no new invention, but, though of late lost sight of, was well known, and generally acknowledged through all Christian antiquity. Into this subject, then, we will enter here ; which will afford an opportunity fully to explain the views of the New Church, both with respect to the judgment performed on resuscitated men collectively at the close of the dispensations under which they had lived, and on resuscitated men individually at the close of this mortal life.

We will first notice *the necessity for such an intermediate world and state, and the Scripture-proof of its existence* : and we will then advert to *the knowledge anciently possessed on the subject, with various particulars respecting it*.

I. We are, first, to notice *the necessity for such an intermediate world and state, and the Scripture-proof of its existence*.

Where, then, could any General Judgment be performed, but in some common receptacle, open to every spirit the moment he quits the body, and which, without being, itself, either heaven or hell, constitutes a world between both, and may

serve as an introduction to either? Where, indeed, can any individual of the human race receive his judgment, either, to heaven or to hell, but in some intermediate region, distinct both from the one and from the other?

The Roman Catholics, it is well known, hold a kind of intermediate state, which they call purgatory. This they feign to be a place of severe torment, destined for purifying the souls of the good from the defilements adhering to the fleshly nature: and in which it is pretended, they are liable to remain for thousands of years, unless delivered through the efficacy of the prayers of the saints and the papal indulgencies, which are purchased by the credulous for that purpose. Upon a certain fact has thus been founded an extravagant fiction: hence Protestants have for the most part, rejected the doctrine of an intermediate state altogether, discarding the truth along with the perversion. As observed by the accomplished Dr. T. Burnet, in his work, quoted in Sect. III., *On the State of the dead*, "the reformed divines, to avoid the terrors of purgatory, have entirely taken away the intermediate state; as we are too apt, in avoiding one folly, to run into another." "It is very well known," he continues, "that the Roman purgatory is adapted to the humors of the people and the gains of the priest: but why should these phantoms fright us away from the search of truth, and the opinions of the ancients, concerning the hitherto unfulfilled state of misery and happiness, before the day of judgment?" Why, indeed! when it is an unquestionable fact, that the belief of an intermediate state of departed spirits, and of a world appropriated to their reception, was universal among Christians, as shall be shown presently, long before the Romish purgatory was ever thought of. Is it not then the extreme of rashness to abolish the belief of an intermediate state, because, under the reign of Romish corruption, it had been changed into purgatory? And is it not the extreme of injustice to charge the illustrious Swedenborg, as some of his opponents have done, with reviving the Romish purgatory, because he restores the older Christian and Scriptural doctrine of an intermediate state?

To avoid confusion it may here be necessary to observe, that most Christians admit the doctrine of an intermediate state in one sense, meaning by it the state of the soul, after death, before it is reunited to the body; whence they also call it the *separate* state: But not looking for any resurrection of the body, *we* mean by the phrase, the state of man after death, before he is received into heaven or plunged into hell: consequently, our idea of it supposes an intermediate spiritual world, or region of the spiritual world at large, as being, in that state, the scene

of his existence ; which also results from our idea, that the spirit, separate from the body of clay, is not a mere vapor or puff of breath, but as a substantial body of its own, though, as consisting of spiritual and not of material substances, is not perceptible to the senses of men in this world.

Our idea of this intermediate world is, that it is situated in the middle between heaven and hell. To those who are in it, heaven appears above, over their heads, and hell beneath, under their feet. Hence, the common forms of speaking of heaven and hell as being respectively above and below, which are completely void of meaning in reference to the natural world, are perfectly true in regard to the appearances of things in the spiritual world ; and from knowledge respecting this, either intuitively perceived or traditionally retained, all such forms of speech derive their origin. Into this intermediate world, then, every one, we conceive, first enters after death, and makes a longer or a shorter stay in it, according to the conformity between his internal and his external state ; though, from the moment of his leaving the body, his final doom is fixed irreversibly. Since the Last Judgment, this stay in the intermediate world is in no case very extensively protracted : but prior thereto, the case was different, and many even remained there during the whole period that intervened between one General Judgment and another. Thus a General Judgment consists in the removal of the wicked from the stations they had there acquired to their abodes in hell ; and in the elevation to heaven of certain of the good, who had been reserved, in the meantime, in places of safety, but who could not be taken up into heaven, till the wicked, who occupied the intermediate sphere, had been thence removed.

These three propositions then, — 1. *That there is such an intermediate region of the spiritual world :* 2. *That at the time of the Judgment the wicked are removed from the stations they had there usurped ;* and, 3. *That the good, having been previously reserved in places of safety, are then elevated into heaven ;* may be clearly proved by the testimony of the Scriptures.

That such an intermediate state and world are supposed through the whole of the Old Testament is generally acknowledged by men of learning ; though, forgetting that the writers of those books were guided by inspiration, it is but too common to imagine that they herein only followed their predjudices, and wrote in compliance with the vulgar belief of the Jewish nation. However, explain it away as they may, learned men are constrained to acknowledge, that the Hebrew word *Sheol* does not properly mean *hell* (in the common sense of that word), as it is translated in some passages of the English Bible, nor yet

merely *the grave*, as it is translated in others, but that it means the place and state of the dead, or the abode and state of departed spirits, on their first leaving the body, and prior to their receiving their final judgment.

The same idea, also, it is universally known, was attached (with some varieties) by the ancients in general, whether Jews, Christians or heathens, to the Greek word *Hades*, the proper meaning of which is, *the unseen world*. This term often occurs in the New Testament, where it is always translated *hell*: but as, according to the observation of the ancient father called St. Augustine, it there appears to be commonly used to signify the abode and state hereafter of the wicked, I do not mention *this* as a proof of an intermediate world and state. In the New Testament use of the word, it seems usually to signify what we now call hell; but in its common use among the Greek writers in general, it certainly signified the state and abode of departed spirits in general, and, among Jews and Christians, their state prior to the last judgment, in a region distinct both from hell and heaven.

But if the New Testament use of the word *Hades* does not prove the existence of an intermediate state, that part of Scripture contains many other statements which place it beyond dispute. For instance: We find John speaking* of certain "souls" that he "saw under the altar" importuning the Lord to accomplish the judgment; which is a plain allusion to a state which was neither hell nor heaven, and out of which those who were in it, though good, could not be taken, and elevated into heaven, till the judgment was performed, which, therefore, they were desirous should be effected: thus we here have positive proof of the *first* and *third* of our propositions just above stated. And the same book (which treats nearly throughout, either of the Last Judgment itself or of the preparations for it, and not of natural and historical events, a continued series of which the commentators have vainly each in his own way, endeavored to find in it;—this book) supplies us with proof of our *second* proposition equally decisive. We read in chap. xii. of war being seen in heaven, and a great dragon being thence cast out into the earth; and in ch. xx., we are informed, that an angel came down from heaven, and laid hold of the dragon, and cast him from the earth into the bottomless pit. Now where could this heaven and earth be, but in the intermediate region of the spiritual world? Can we suppose that the dragon could have intruded into the heaven inhabited by angels, so as to make a war necessary to expel him? Even if we admit the common notion to be true,—that the *present* inhabitants of the infernal

* Rev. vi. 9, 10, 14.

regions were once inmates of heaven, and were thence ejected after a battle waged within the blissful seats; yet the wildest fancy that ever revelled in such themes never dreamed of any more such wars and fallings of angels than one; and that one is believed to have occurred before the beginning of the world, not, as this is described, at the time of the Last Judgment, and forming, in fact, a part of it. Here then we have plain evidence of the truth of our *first* and *second* propositions: we have a clear notice of an intermediate state and world, and of the removal of the wicked from the station they there occupied at the time of the Last Judgment.

Many other testimonies to the same effect might be brought from the Apocalypse; for though that book is written throughout in language evidently symbolic, it represents events which occurred at, and preparatory to, the last judgment; and the scene of most of those events is evidently neither in heaven nor in hell, but in a world between both. But it is not from the Apocalypse alone that these truths may be confirmed; for though it is in this book only that we find a circumstantial account of the judgment attending the Lord's second advent, other books of the New Testament afford, as is shown above, plain notices respecting the judgment performed by the Lord at his first advent: and some of the circumstances attending this former judgment,—such as prove clearly all our three propositions,—are distinctly described. For example: It is an article of the Apostles' Creed, that the Lord Jesus Christ, after his crucifixion, “descended into hell;” where that the term *hell*, which in Greek is *hades*, does not mean the place of punishment but the intermediate state, is generally admitted; though how he so descended, with what he did there, is so little understood, that many of the moderns would be glad to get rid of the article altogether.

A brief examination of this seemingly mysterious circumstance will throw considerable light on our present subject.

The passages of the New Testament most relied upon by the ancients for the proof of the doctrine of the Lord's descent into *hades* are three. “Now that he ascended,” says the Apostle,* “what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?”—where the phrase, *to descend into the lower parts of the earth*, is the same as is sometimes used in the Old Testament† to describe the state of the spirit after death. Though this text, I have little doubt, was rightly applied by the ancients, the next is generally thought to be more conclusive. It is the application by Peter of a passage in the Psalms: David, he says, “seeing this before, spake of the res-

* Eph. iv. 9.

† See Ps. lxiii. 9.

urrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption.”* But though these passages speak of the Lord’s descent to *hades*, or the intermediate state and world, they did not disclose what he did there : this deficiency, however is supplied by the third, which also, I have no doubt, was rightly applied by the ancients to this subject, though some of the moderns have had recourse to the most far-fetched glosses to explain its evident meaning away. “Christ,” says the Apostle Peter,† “being put to death in the flesh but quickened by the spirit ; by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison :” — “where,” says Bishop Pearson,‡ “the Spirit seems to be the soul of Christ, and the spirits in prison the souls of them that were in hell. And what spirits, specifically, these were, the Apostle explicitly states ; for he adds,§ “Which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein a few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water.” In these seemingly mysterious words we certainly have an explicit notice of two great judgments, — both of that performed by the Lord Jesus Christ, and of that accomplished at the period of the flood ; which, we are at the same time informed, was not entirely a final one, but consisted in placing those upon whom it was executed in a separate region of the spiritual world, here called being in prison, to be finally disposed of at the Lord’s coming into the world. This final disposal of them was accomplished, we are instructed, by the Lord’s going to preach to them ; by which we are not to understand such a preaching as that which he orally practiced on earth, but the outpouring of the sphere of his Divine Truth, which, we have already seen, is the medium by which all his works of judgment are accomplished, and which could not be given in such power as to effect the complete separation between the wicked and the good in the spiritual world, and thus to execute the final judgment on them, till the glorification of the Lord’s Human Nature was effected. The descent of the sphere of the Lord’s Divine Truth into the lower parts of the spiritual world, in sufficient power to accomplish these mighty works, is then what in reality is meant by his descent into hell, or *hades*.

It may tend to elucidate this subject if we remark, that when Peter thus speaks of the Lord’s *going and preaching to the spirits in prison*, he evidently means to apply and interpret those passages in the Prophets, in which, among the redeeming

* Acts ii. 31.

† Eph. iii. 18, 19.

‡ In his learned and laborious Exposition of the Creed.

§ Ver. 20.

acts of the Lord at his coming into the world, the deliverance of prisoners is mentioned. There can indeed be no doubt that the Apostle had particularly in view these words of Isaiah,* which are applied to himself by the Lord†: “The spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to *preach* good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to *proclaim liberty to the captives*, and *the opening of the prison to them that are bound*; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God.” Now though this passage, which explicitly speaks of *preaching* and *proclaiming* to them that are in *prison*, refers, in its spiritual sense, to the spiritual deliverance from the bondage of error which was introduced by the gospel, it is obviously applied by the Apostle, in its literal sense, to the liberation of those in the spiritual world who were reserved in the lower parts of that world till the coming of the Lord. The same prophet speaks elsewhere of the Lord as coming “to bring out the *prisoners from prison*, and them that sit in darkness out of the *prison-house*.”‡ So he affirms again, that he shall “say unto the *prisoners*, Go forth; to them that are in darkness, Show yourselves.”§ All which, and various similar passages in the Prophets and Psalms, the Apostle evidently had in his eye, when he spoke of the Lord as *going to preach to the spirits in prison*.

Here we have further proof from the New Testament of all our three propositions, — 1. *of the existence of an intermediate state and world*, and, 2. *of the removal of the wicked from the stations they had obtained there*, with, 3. *the consequent elevation into heaven of the good, who had been in the mean time reserved in a place of safety*.

II. We will now in the second place advert, as proposed, to *the knowledge anciently possessed on the subject of an intermediate world and state; with various particulars respecting it*.

First, then, I will here offer evidence to prove, *That the doctrine of the New Church respecting an intermediate world and state, which is the first receptacle of man after death, and out of a certain region of which the good were taken and elevated to heaven by the Lord at the time of his first advent, is in agreement with the doctrine of primitive Christianity*. I will, Secondly, endeavor to evince, *That the deliverance of the good who were thus reserved at the time of the Lord's coming, or in consequence of the Lord's then going and preaching to the spirits in prison, with the final dismissal to hell of the wicked, is what is specifically meant by those texts which speak of the dead as coming out of their graves, and which are erroneously ap-*

* CH. LXI. 1, 2.

† LUKE IX. 1.

‡ CH. CII. 7.

§ NUM. 3.

plied in favor of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. In the Third place, I will endeavor to show, That the Last Judgment predicted in the Gospels and in the Revelation was to be attended with similar circumstances. And, Lastly, I will conclude with a summary statement of the views of the New Church respecting the judgment that takes place upon man, individually, after death.

1. We are, in the *first place*, to prove, *That the doctrine of the New Church in regard to the existence of an intermediate region and world, which is the first receptacle of man after death, and out of a certain region of which the good were taken and elevated to heaven by the Lord at the time of his first advent, is in agreement with the doctrine of primitive Christianity.*

That the early Christians entertained views to this effect, though mixed with some obscurity and error, is abundantly evident from the following passages from the Greek and Latin Fathers; which I translate from the copious store of extracts from their writings adduced by the learned Bishop Pearson in the notes to his "*Exposition of the Creed*," under the article "*He descended into hell.*"

It will be necessary to recollect, as intimated above, that by the place called *hades*, which is commonly translated *hell*, the ancients did not mean the place of eternal punishment, but the common receptacle of departed spirits, not including heaven, or the proper mansions of the blest; nor, strictly speaking, *hell*, considered as the place of punishment; though sometimes, rather inconsistently with their own views, they used the term with such latitude as to include the latter.

Irenæus says, "*As the Lord went into the midst of the shadow of death, where the souls of the dead were,* — it is manifest that the souls of his disciples also, for whose sakes the Lord wrought these works, will go into an invisible place provided for them by God."* "*Clemens Alexandrinus,*" says Pearson, "*was so clearly of that opinion, that he thought the soul of Christ preached salvation to the souls in hell [hades !†]. And Tertullian proves that the Inferi [a Latin name for hades] are a cavity in the earth, where the souls of dead men are, because the soul of Christ went thither :*" he says, "*that Christ our God did not ascend to the higher parts of heaven until he had first descended to the lower parts of the earth, and communicated himself to the patriarchs and prophets, who were there reserved.*"‡ — "*His body being laid in the grave, his Divinity, with his human soul, descended to hell, and called forth from their places there the souls of the saints.*"§ "*Chrysostom,*" says

* 1. v. 26.

† Strom. 1. vi. 6.

‡ De Anima, c. 55.

§ Gaudentius Brix, Tr. 10.

Pearson, "in his Tractate proving that Christ is God, makes this exposition of Isaiah xlv. 2. "I will break in pieces the gates of brass, and cut in sunder the bars of iron, and I will open the treasures of darkness, the hidden riches of secret places will I show thee." It is "*hades*," says Chrysostom, "that he so calls; for *HADES held holy souls*, and possessed rich furniture, *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob being there*; wherefore he calls them its treasures." — "For the salvation of *the souls in HADES, who had been waiting many ages for the opening of it*, he went thither."* — "He went to the lower parts of the earth, that he might *redeem the righteous from thence*."† "As the Godhead was to consummate all things according to the mystery of the passion, he went with his soul to the lower parts of the earth, *to accomplish the salvation of those that had before fallen asleep, that is, of the holy patriarchs*." — "Although the body of Moses did not appear on earth, we no where read of his being in heavenly glory, till after the Lord, as a pledge of his own resurrection, had loosed the bonds of hell, and *raised from thence the souls of the pious*."‡ — "The saints who were kept in that place hoped for the loosing of their bonds at the coming of Christ. After his death, therefore, Christ descended thither. As the angel descended into the Babylonian furnace, to deliver the three children, so Christ descended to the furnace of hell, *where the souls of the just were kept shut up*. He broke open the prisons of the *infern*i; he wasted and spoiled them, *delivering out of them the souls that were bound*."§

Here then it is evident, as Pearson observes, that some of the ancient fathers "thought that Christ descended to that place of *HADES where the souls of all the faithful*, from the death of the righteous Abel to the death of Christ, *were detained*; and there *dissolving all the power by which they were detained below*, translated them into a far more glorious place, and estated them in a condition far more happy in the heavens above."

Pearson, however adds, that "others understood no translation of place, or alteration of condition there, conceiving that the souls of all men are detained below still, and shall not enter heaven till the general resurrection." To establish this assertion he quotes Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Hilary, and Gregory of Nyssa; but the passages cited do not clearly prove that those fathers believed none to have been taken out of *hades* at the Lord's descent thither, but only, that all who should die afterwards were to be reserved there till the final judgment.

But there were some who thought that the place in which the patriarchs and principal saints resided could not properly

* Euseb. Dem. 1. x. 8.

† Amb. 1. iv. *De Fide*.

‡ Cyril. Cat. iv. 8.

§ Hieron in Eccl.

be called *hell*, nor was ever so named in the Scriptures: Thus Augustine says, "I do not see what benefit was conferred, by the Lord's descent into hell, on those righteous persons *who were in Abraham's bosom*; for they had never ceased to enjoy the beatific presence of his Divinity."* These were of opinion, that the end of the Lord's descent into hell, was, to deliver "*less purified souls*," and to translate them to a place of happiness and a glorious condition." Thus Augustine says again, "Let us hold fast the belief confirmed by the most sure authority, that Christ died according to the Scriptures, and was buried, and the third day rose again; and the other things which are written concerning him with most certainly attested truth. Among which is this: that *he was present with those below*, loosing for them those pains by which it was impossible for himself to be held; whence we rightly understand, that *he loosed and delivered whom he would*."† Again: "This that is written, *Having loosed the pains of hell*,‡ it is not to be understood of *all*, but of *some*, whom he deemed worthy of such deliverance; that it may neither be thought, that he descended thither in vain, conferring no benefit on any who were kept there; nor that it follows thence that what the divine mercy and justice granted to some, was bestowed on all."the inferi, terrifying those that had the power of death by the presence of his invincible majesty; and, *to deliver whom he would*, he commanded the gates of hell to be unlocked."|| — And Ambrose: "He, being free among the dead, having loosed the law of death, *gave remission to those who were in hell*."¶ But Cyril carries the matter very far indeed: "He spoiled all *hades*," says he, "and, opening the inevitable gates to the spirits of them that slept, he rose again, *leaving HADES desert, with none in it but the devil*."***

Pearson informs us, further, that it was "the general opinion of the fathers," that "the preaching of the gospel to the dead," the proper idea of which we have seen above, "was the means by which that good was wrought for the souls below which was effected by his death." Thus Irenæus: "Therefore the Lord descended to the parts under the earth, *preaching the good tidings of his coming to them also*, and becoming remission of sins to those who believed on him. But *all those believed on*

* *Ep. ad Euod.* 99, al 164. § 8.

† *Ep.* 99, al 164, § 14.

‡ Acts ii. 24, according to some copies.

§ *Ibid.* § 5.

|| *Ep. ad Hisp.* p. 49.

¶ *De Incarn.* c. 5.

*** *Hom. Pasch.* 7, t. v. par. 2, p. 91.

him who had hoped in him ; that is, they who had foretold his coming and obeyed his requirements, — the righteous men, the prophets, and the patriarchs ; whose sins he remitted, as he does ours."* Pearson gives extracts to the same effect from Clement of Alexandria, Cyril of Alexandria, and Jobius.

Here, certainly, though mixed with some misconceptions, we have the plain testimony of the early Christians to the great facts for which we are contending. Important truths, though variously apprehended, were evidently at the bottom of all the above ideas. If, on the one hand, it is not true, as many supposed, that all the good who had died from the beginning of the world remained in *hades* till taken thence by the Lord Jesus Christ, but, as Augustine judiciously concludes, *they who are described as being in Abraham's bosom were actually enjoying the beatific presence of God*, or in other words, were in heaven ; and if, on the other hand, it is not true, as many likewise supposed, that *all* who were in *hades*, without exception, were taken into heaven by the Lord Jesus Christ ; the genuine truth, of which these are exaggerations, nevertheless shines through them, and adopting the sentiment which lies between the two extremes, we may safely conclude, that *some who could not be elevated to heaven before, were taken out of HADES by the Lord at his first advent*. And even the assertion of Cyril, that *all* were then delivered *except the devil*, is perfectly true, if we understand the word "devil" in its spiritual sense, as denoting, not a single fallen angel, but all, considered in one great aggregate, who are inwardly wicked. All such, at a general judgment, are not only not taken into heaven, but are plunged irrevocably into hell ; but all who are not inwardly wicked, thus all who are inwardly good, are then taken out of the places in the spiritual world where they had in the mean time been reserved, and are elevated into heaven. Such a work was performed by the Lord at the judgment he executed at his first advent ; and hence the fathers of the first ages so positively, and so unanimously, affirm, that he delivered from *hades* whom he would — that is, as we have seen it explained by Irenæus, all who were capable of believing on him in consequence of having, while in the world, lived in faith and obedience.

I cannot help regarding this testimony of the ancient fathers as extremely valuable ; for it surely must have a strong tendency to satisfy every candid mind, that the doctrine of the New Church upon this curious and important subject, is the doctrine of the Scriptures and of the true Christian religion. It is true, that modern divines reject these views of the primitive

* *Adv. Hær.* 1. iv. 45.

Christian writers, and strain to different meanings the texts upon which they are founded ; but it is of no small importance that we are able to show, that the views which modern Christians are so unwilling to receive, respecting the operations performed in the spiritual world — in fact, the accomplishment there of a general judgment — by the Lord at his first advent, are completely in agreement with the sentiments of the early Christians; and that, when our views are compared with those of the primitive times, even what in the latter was erroneous is seen only to have originated in the partial and too literal apprehension of certain general truths. (It might also be easy to show, and, in fact, it already in part appears from the above extracts, that the sentiments of the early Christians on the subject of Redemption were completely in agreement with ours. Instead of that unscriptural and artificial “scheme of redemption” so much in vogue at the present day, they viewed redemption as consisting in the subjugation, by the Lord, of hell, and the consequent deliverance of man from the power of the devil : and though on this subject also they fell into some misconceptions, these, likewise, were only such as originated in the partial and too literal apprehensions of general truths).

2. We are, in the *second* place, to endeavor to evince, That the deliverance of the good who were thus reserved at the time of the Lord’s coming, or in consequence of the Lord’s *going and preaching to the spirits in prison, with the final dismissal to hell of the wicked, is what is specifically meant by those texts, which speak of the dead as coming out of their graves, and which are erroneously applied in favor of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body.* I particularly mean John v. 28 : “The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth ; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation :” And Matt. xxvii. 52, 53 : “And the graves were opened, and many bodies of saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many.”

The fathers we have seen following the language of Scripture, affirm, that the place out of which the Lord took the spirits that were bound, was *under the earth, and in the lower parts of the earth.* This phrase, though obviously untrue if used of the *material earth*, is taken from the arrangement of things in the spiritual world, and is agreeable to the appearances which there take place when a judgment is performed ; for the intermediate place in which the spirit first appears after death is spoken of in Scripture as the *earth* of that world ; and

under this are the places of security for those who are to be taken up to heaven at the judgment. This is evident from the remarkable passage, Rev. vi. 9, 10, 11, slightly noticed above. John the Revelator there says, "I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held. And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth. And white robes were given unto every one of them, and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow servants also, and their brethren, that should be killed as they were should be fulfilled." These souls are evidently those who are reserved in places of safety during the interval preceding the time of the judgment. They are described as being *under the altar*, which is the same thing as saying that they were *under the earth*, only the term *altar*, which of course is supposed to stand *on the earth* is used as a symbol of the Lord's Divine love under the protection of which they were. These places of reservation being thus to appearance, under the earth, they are called, in other passages of Scripture *graves*. Indeed, the idea attached to the word *graves* in Scripture, in the literal sense, is not so much, as with us, from our mode of burial, that of a place to which the body is committed to be out of the way, or of a place of rejection, as of a place of preservation: thus the Jews had chambers hewn out of the rock for depositing their dead, the mouths of which were closed with a great stone; as in the case of the grave of Lazarus, and that of Joseph of Arimathea, in which the body of the Lord was laid. Such graves for the preservation of the dead body, afforded a suitable image of the places provided in the spiritual world, for the preservation of those who were to be transferred to their final homes at the time of judgment; wherefore, in the symbolic language of Scripture, these are called by the same name. Thus when the Lord says, "The hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation*;" the specific reference of the divine declaration is, to the bringing out of the places of reservation in the spiritual world, at the judgment he was then about accomplishing, of those, who like the souls under the altar, could not previously be elevated to heaven; and also, of those who, from the former preparatory judgment in the days of Noah, were "reserved in chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day;" thus of those whom Peter calls "the spirits in prison,"

* See above, p. 154.

by whom he means spirits of both kinds. The voice of the Lord is evidently his Divine Truth; and as all his works of judgment are performed by the pouring forth, with increased power, of the sphere of his Divine Truth, therefore it is said, that this coming forth from these spiritual graves should be in consequence of hearing his voice.

The same thing is signified when it is said, that "the graves were opened" when the Lord expired on the cross, and "many bodies of saints that slept came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many;" the meaning of which, it was observed above,* we should be able to see, when we come to treat of the Last Judgment. The graves here are the places in the spiritual world, where such of the good as could not be elevated into heaven except by virtue of the power proceeding from the Lord's glorified Humanity, were previously reserved. These are called, not saints, but the bodies of saints, to carry on the figure of the opening of graves. Another reason why they are so called, is, because while the greater part of the intermediate world is full of wicked spirits, as was the case at that time, the good, in comparison of these, who appear to themselves as the prevailing party, are regarded as dead; notwithstanding their "life is hid with Christ in God." In this deliverance, also, of those who were thus reserved in the lower parts of the spiritual world till the coming of the Lord,—in this opening of spiritual graves,—the prophecy of Daniel† respecting the awaking of those that slept in the dust of the earth, and other similar declarations of the Old Testament, had, doubtless, their most specific fulfillment.

3. From what has been shown in the two preceding articles, we may safely conclude, as we are in the third place to endeavor to show, *That the Last Judgment of all predicted in the Gospels and in the Revelation, was to be attended with similar circumstances.* Of these we will now offer a brief view, from Rev. xx. where they are summarily described.

From the former part of this prophetic book we find, that those who were reserved in the lower parts of the spiritual world, and who are called‡ the souls under the altar, were not the only servants of the Lord whose fidelity was approved: there was a superior class still of those who had passed into the spiritual world by death; who were taken, in fact, immediately to heaven. These are described§ by the hundred-and-forty-four thousand seen standing with the Lamb on mount Sion; of whom it is said, "These are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth: these were redeemed from among

* P. 77.

† Ch. xii. 2.

‡ Ch. vi. 9.

§ Ch. xiv.

men, being the first-fruits to God and the Lamb." They belong to the same class as those who are said by the Lord to be carried by angels, Like Lazarus, to "Abraham's bosom," and of whom Augustine justly says, in the passage cited above,* that "they had never ceased to enjoy the beatific presence of God." Those who were inwardly most deeply principled in wickedness and in the arts of delusion, though outwardly they had made profession of religion and lived in appearance like Christians (for none who are both inwardly and outwardly wicked and profane are tolerated out of hell for a moment) are represented† by the dragon and his angels who were seen as if in heaven, whence they were cast to the earth. Persons who were inwardly good, but not so strong in their faith and virtue as to bear to be exposed, without injury, to the sphere and arts of the wicked, and who therefore could not be taken up to heaven, till the wicked were removed from the intermediate region, are described as the souls under the altar; who, therefore, were desirous that the judgment should be performed. Accordingly, the twentieth chapter begins with stating, that "an angel came down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit, and a great chain in his hand:" which angel is a representative of the Lord as to the power he exercises by his Divine Truth; and by his descent from heaven is meant precisely the same kind of occurrence as we have before seen is meant by the Lord's descent into hell or *hades*. For‡ he binds the devil and Satan, and casts him into the bottomless pit, for a thousand years; by which is meant, the removal of the worst class of wicked spirits who then ranged at large in the spiritual world, to allow the good who had been reserved in the lower parts of that world to be brought out and raised to heaven. This the Revelator proceeds to describe, by saying,§ "And I saw the souls of them that were beheaded (*smitten with the axe or axed*) for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection." It is evident, from comparing the description of these with that of those before-mentioned as reserved under the altar, that they are the same persons. It is certain, then, that they did not now *begin* to live, for they were living before, though in a different state: but on their emerging from the places in which they were reserved, and coming into the full enjoyment of heavenly life and its delights, and into the perceptible sense of the Lord's presence and of their conjunc-

* P. 164.

† Ch. xiii.

‡ Ver. 2, 3.

§ Ver. 4, 5.

tion with him, they are said to live and reign with Christ. They are represented as slain, and smitten with the axe, for the word of God and for the testimony which they held, or for the witness of Jesus, because they had been rejected and persecuted by the dragon and his crew, and because, during the presence of the latter in the intermediate part of the spiritual world, they could not be taken up into heaven.

Many have been the conjectures which have been made respecting the thousand years here mentioned ; and wild indeed have been the opinions which have sometimes been founded on them. In fact even the most sober of the expositors have found it impossible to adapt this number to their received method of computing prophetic dates. Reckoning, as they do, in regard to all the other notices of time occurring in this book, a year for every day that is mentioned, they ought, in order to be consistent with themselves, to reckon three hundred and sixty thousand years for the period here described : but as this would be a most preposterous duration to assign to any state short of the final one, they generally abide by the exact number, and understand a thousand years to mean a thousand years, neither more nor less. But this, also, is a monstrous duration for a merely intermediate state of things, as the present is evidently described ; especially when it is considered that these *thousand years* occur just in the middle of the *day* of judgment ; for that the judgment had now commenced, and that the elevation to heaven of those holy souls formed a part of it, is certain from the words with which the verse begins : “ And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them.” Whether the usual mode of interpreting prophetic dates, by allowing a year for a day, may or may not be true in regard to those prophecies which refer, in their literal sense, to events to take place in the natural world, we will not stop to inquire ; though it may be remarked, that, in the chief of these, — Daniel’s prophecy of the seventy *weeks* — as there is no mention either of days or years, *weeks of years* may be as well understood as *weeks of days* ; but in a prophecy like this before us, which, even in its literal sense, refers to a transaction in the spiritual world, it is impossible to suppose that natural years can be intended. Natural years can belong only to the natural world : in the spiritual world, neither years, nor time at all, are known. Instead of *time* then, which belongs to the natural world, must be understood that which, in the spiritual world, answers thereto : and this is *state* ; and instead of *numbers*, which also belong to natural things, must be understood that which answers to them in regard to spiritual things ; and this is *equality* or *nature*. By the round number, a thousand years, then, is merely signified,

the quality of the state which intervened between the elevation into heaven of those who were reserved in the lower parts of the spiritual world, or under the earth there, and the remaining stages of the last judgment; as also, the complete opposition and separation of state between those who thus lived and reigned with Christ, and those called the devil and Satan, who were bound in the abyss, or restrained from exercising any influence, during the same interval: and, if we cannot separate the idea of time altogether from our natural conceptions, it may also mean, not any *determinate* portion of time, but, the *interval whether long or short*, that was necessary for the performance of these transactions.

Next follows* an account of the loosing again of the devil, and the commotions excited in consequence: which represent the opening of the interiors of those who live as merely natural men, and form the most external class of the professing members of the church: upon which they discover their before-concealed hatred against the true Church of the Lord and its sacred principles. Then† “the devil,” it is said, “was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone;” which describes the final state of misery experienced in hell by the worst class of the wicked. Afterwards follows a solemn description of the judgment upon those who had not before been disposed-of; that is, of those who neither belonged to the saints who were reserved in places of safety, nor to those called the devil and Satan. “I saw a great white throne, and Him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away, and there was found no place for them.”‡ This describes the total change of state in the spiritual world, in consequence of the removal of all who had been collected in the different parts of the intervening region from the stations which they previously occupied. “And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works.”§ The dead, small and great, are the rest of those who had passed by death from the natural to the spiritual world of all classes. By the books are signified the interiors of every one’s mind and memory, in which all his actions and thoughts, notwithstanding they may have vanished from the exteriors of his mind, or may seem to be forgotten, remain as distinctly recorded as if written in a book: the book of life is the interiors of the minds of the good, whose life is formed by the commandments of the Word of God. “And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead

* Ver. 7, 8, 9.

† Ver. 10.

‡ Ver. 11.

§ Ver. 12.

which were in them : and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life, was cast into the lake of fire.”* By the sea which gave up its dead, is not meant the ocean which surrounds the land, but the state of those who live as merely natural men : for the sea, as being, according to appearance, the extreme boundary of the earth, is constantly mentioned in Scripture to denote what is merely natural and most external. By death and hell, which gave up their dead, are meant the state of those who are inwardly wicked, and, immersed in infernal lusts and false persuasions, — such as constitute spiritual death, and are the essence of hell ; and by their being cast into the lake of fire, is meant the immersion of all in whom those states prevail in hell, and its torments. That death and hell cannot here signify either persons or places, must be obvious to every one.

As for the exposition adopted by those who apply this passage to the notion of the resurrection of the body, who pretend that the casting of death and hell into the lake of fire is only a symbolic way of saying that there shall no longer be any natural death nor any intermediate state of the soul ; it is really too far-fetched, and destitute of all support whatever, to be worthy of a moment’s consideration. Does not the lake of fire evidently denote a place and state of punishment ? But how could Death and *Hades*, — mere ideal abstractions, be subjects of punishment ? If it be said, as they who maintain this opinion do say, that the casting of death and hell into the lake of fire only means, simply, their ceasing to exist ; then the casting there of those who are not found written in the book of life can only mean their ceasing to exist : and thus we shall be driven to the conclusion, that the wicked are annihilated. Indeed, there are many who affirm, that this is all that is meant by the phrase in this case also : and though this idea is unfounded, and almost obviously absurd, yet it is not incumbered with the inconsistency incurred by those who maintain, that to be cast into the lake of fire, in the case of Death and Hell, means an end to all existence, and, in the case of those who are not found written in the book of life, and endless existence in a state of misery.

4. We are to conclude this branch of our inquiries with a *summary statement of the views of the New Church respecting the judgment upon man, individually after death.*

The case in regard to this important subject, as we understand it, is this. *Before the Last Judgment, all who were both*

* Ver. 13, 14, 15.

inwardly and outwardly good, were either raised immediately, or after a short stay in the intermediate world, to heaven, like Lazarus in the parable ; or were reserved in places of safety, with the souls under the altar, where they were in a happy state : and all who were both inwardly and outwardly profane and wicked were immediately plunged into hell like the rich man at whose gate Lazarus sat. Upon these then, certainly, an individual judgment was immediately performed. But they who, though inwardly wicked, had outwardly lived in the observance of morality, and in the profession of religion, though not from spiritual but merely natural motives, were allowed to remain, till the time of the general judgment, in the intermediate region : as were also many simple good spirits, who were externally connected with the others, being imposed upon by their specious appearance and professions. This continuance of bad and good in the intermediate region of the spiritual world till the time of the judgment, is expressly affirmed by the Lord in his parable of the wheat and the tares. Yet, in these cases also, an individual judgment was virtually performed on every one at his first entrance into the spiritual world ; for, from that moment, every one was bound, as to his interiors, to his final abode either in heaven or hell ; and into this he came, as soon as his exterior state was put off and his internal state laid open by the process of the judgment : thus from the moment of the entrance of every one into the spiritual world his lot was decided ; it was no longer in his power to make any change in his interior state : and with this, finally, his exterior state would be made to agree ; when he would actually enter into heaven or hell. But *now*, as we believe, the Last Judgment has been accomplished : no other general judgment is ever to take place : in consequence, then, of the new arrangement which has thus been effected in the spiritual world, the individual judgment which is passed on every one immediately on his entering the spiritual world, is *now*, in every case, speedily executed ; and while numbers, as before, pass immediately, or nearly so, to heaven or hell, in no case is the stay in the intermediate state protracted to any very considerable extent. In the majority of cases, indeed, some stay in the intermediate world is absolutely necessary : and hence we see the necessity that such a world should exist. For who can look at the mixed characters which constitute the great bulk of mankind ; who can observe how few of the worst are destitute of every thing that is good, and how few of the best are in any very considerable degree from the frailties of degenerate nature ; and can suppose that all of the one class are fit for no society but that of devils, and all of the other are complete-

ly prepared for the society of angels, the moment they quit the body? Do not the greatest part of mankind leave this world in a sort of intermediate state, neither entirely good nor utterly bad? Where then can they resuscitate in the other life but in an intermediate world? But though most who depart out of the world are in this mixed state, they nevertheless all belong to one or other of two entirely different classes. All are either inwardly good, though they have some imperfections not entirely surmounted in their external man; or are inwardly wicked, though they have in the external some appearances of good induced by habit and profession in society. In both cases, then, every thing in the external which does not agree with the love and faith, or no-faith, of the internal, is to be put off. This is effected, by divine means provided for the purpose, in the intermediate state and world. But, as already observed, no one is now permitted to tarry there very long; and either heaven itself, or hell itself, is now speedily the portion of all.

I introduced the discussion, in the present PART of this SECTION, on the necessity for an intermediate world and state, and on the Scripture-proof of its existence, with a quotation from the learned and intelligent Dr. T. Burnet, on the folly of Protestants in rejecting such a state, to avoid the Roman Catholic folly of purgatory. I will close the evidences now given, that the doctrine of the New Church on this subject is in agreement with the doctrine of primitive Christianity, with an extract from a more recent author, whose works have but lately been introduced to the British public.

“The universal Christian world,” says Dr. Jung-Stilling, in his *Theory of Pneumatology*, “from the very commencement, believed generally in an invisible world of spirits, which was divided into three different regions: heaven, or the place of blessedness, — hell, or the place of torment, — and then a third place, which the Bible calls *hades*, or the receptacle of the dead; in which those souls which were not ripe for either destination, are fully made meet for that, to which they have most adapted themselves in this life.”

After a statement of the ancient theory of the material universe, the author proceeds, “The Bible has nothing to object to the views adopted by the universal Christian Church: and the Aristotelian and Platonic philosophy of the schools, which then universally governed the reason of the learned, was also perfectly contented with them. And if here and there a clear-sighted individual, who thought for himself, found this or that point impossible, or some fervent Gnostic, on the other side, introduced still more impossibilities into this system of the uni-

verse and of spirits, it occasioned a paper war and a charge of heresy ; but the principal ideas still continued to stand firmly and canonically in both churches — the eastern Greek, and the western Latin.——

“ But ere long, particularly after the age of Constantine the Great, the clergy gradually forgot Christ’s golden precept, ‘ Let the greatest among you be as the least, and him that will bear rule, let him be as a servant.’ In opposition to this, they assumed increasing honors, and even strove for the universal government of the world. But having no worldly weapons, or at least very feeble ones, they forged themselves spiritual arms, and the invisible world presented them an inexhaustible armory. Hades, which had been hitherto, in itself, an abode devoid of suffering, unless the individual brought anguish and torment in his own bosom into it, was now transformed into a fiery furnace, in which every departed soul that had not rendered itself worthy of canonization, must of necessity be purified, like gold and silver. Now this was a particularly potent means of bringing even the mightiest monarchs, with all their hosts, and every Christian nation, into obedience to the clergy : for the latter asserted, and it was universally believed, that they really had the keys of purgatory, and that by prayers and masses for the dead, for which they took care to be well paid, they were able to deliver the poor soul from it, and to assist it in the attainment of the bliss of heaven.——

“ Here we arrive at the principal source of the most senseless and revolting superstition, which certainly deserves to be rooted out. But *this is not to be accomplished by refusing to give credence to undeniable facts, but by stating the sacred truth in its genuine purity.*

“ The Christian system of the spiritual and material world, described above, stood for fifteen hundred years unshaken. [Copernicus, it is noticed, overturned the old system of the material world, and] Luther and his confederates accomplished a mighty revolution in religion. The Holy Scriptures again became the sole criterion of faith and conduct, and the clergy of the Protestant Church renounced all claim to the government of the invisible world : they extinguished the flames of purgatory, and enlarged the bounds of hell by adding hades to it. No middle state, or place of purification, was any longer believed in, but every departed soul entered immediately on its place of destination, either heaven or hell. They carried this point too far : *it was wrong to make a purgatory of hades ; BUT IT WAS ALSO GOING TOO FAR TO DO AWAY WITH HADES TOGETHER WITH PURGATORY.*”*

* Translation by Jackson, 1834, pp. 11—18.

SECTION IV.

THE LAST JUDGMENT.

PART IV.

The Last Judgment actually accomplished.

HAVING, in the previous PARTS of this SECTION, given, I venture to hope, sufficient evidence of the truth of our FIRST GENERAL PROPOSITION, — *That, according to the Scriptures, the scene of the Last Judgment was to be, not in the natural world, as commonly believed, but in the spiritual*; — having shown, in connection with this truth, that there is strong proof of the fact, that more than one General Judgment has already, in that world, been accomplished; and that there is, in that world, an intermediate region which is the specific scene of all General and Particular Judgments: — We are now to proceed to the confirmation of our SECOND GENERAL PROPOSITION; *That the Last Judgment has, in the spiritual world, been executed accordingly.*

Here I am to endeavor to show, that, independently of the assertions of Swedenborg, there are various considerations tending to evince, that the Judgment has been accomplished.

First, be it observed, that according to our views, there always exists, how little soever men in general may be aware of it, the closest communication between the spiritual and the natural worlds. Man, as to the interiors of his mind, is a spiritual being, and in constant connection with his like in the spiritual world; though of this he cannot, except in very extraordinary cases, be sensible, while his spiritual part is invested with a natural covering, which is the seat of his conscious perceptions while he lives on earth. This is, in fact, only a different way of stating the doctrine generally received among Christians, that man receives influences both from heaven and hell: and how can it be otherwise, if the Apostolic declarations are true, that angels “are ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation;” and that, “the devil,” or the infernal powers in the aggregate, “goeth about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he shall devour.” But though the springs of all man’s thoughts and actions are thus either in heaven or in hell, his most immediate unearthly associates are spirits in the intermediate state or region between heaven and hell; all of whom belong, indeed either to the heavenly or to the infernal

kingdom, and are, as in their interiors, either angels or devils, though, not having yet entirely put off their external state, they have not entered into their final abode. Man himself, as to the interiors of his mind, is a spirit of this kind; with this difference, that although he is every moment of his life in connection, according to the nature of his ruling inclinations, with heaven or with hell, he is not yet irrevocably bound either to the one or to the other: so long as he remains here his ruling love may be changed: and thus he is associated as to his internal part with spirits of both classes, and is not, as they are, incapable of altering his inward state.

If then this view of the subject be correct (and that it is so, will probably further appear in the sequel of this Appeal; and surely it is a view that is highly agreeable to reason); if man be thus so closely connected with the inhabitants of the spiritual world, particularly with those of the intermediate region; it necessarily follows, that any great change in the state of that world, particularly of the intermediate region, must make also an extraordinary change in the state of man as to the interiors of his mind, and induce great alterations in his modes of thinking. It may also be expected, that the effect of such an operation in the spiritual world as that of the General Judgment, must be felt in the natural world also, and that judgments answering to it in importance would take place in the civil affairs of the world, particularly among the nations belonging to the professing church. If it be true, as would follow from the above statement, that the interior causes of all things are in the spiritual world, it will follow, that the performance of such a work as the Last Judgment there, must, sooner or later, be marked in the natural world also with corresponding effects.

In the second place, I would observe, that the conclusion respecting the effects, in the natural world, of the judgment in the spiritual, thus arrived at theoretically, has been practically confirmed in all former instances. As far as the annals of mankind enable us to determine, never was a judgment performed in the spiritual world, but corresponding effects resulted in the natural world also. If it be true, as generally believed, that the last posterity of the Adamic church was swallowed up by a flood, here was a catastrophe in the natural world indeed: and if, as noticed above, there is reason to conclude, that by the history of the flood is not meant that a flood of waters really overwhelmed the world, there still cannot be a doubt that great calamities, of which, in a figurative natural sense, a flood of waters is an expressive emblem, did overtake the abandoned nations. So at the consummation of the Noetic and establishment of the Israelitish church, when a representative coming of the

Lord was exhibited by his presence in the cloudy pillar, great judgments were literally executed on the Egyptians and the Canaanites, at that time the principal nations of the consummated Noetic church; as had previously been executed, soon after the calling of Abraham, on Sodom and Gomorrah. But here again we find our most unequivocal example in the judgments that fell upon the Jews. We have seen that a judgment was certainly executed by the Lord in the spiritual world while he abode personally here: and we know that, some time afterwards, the most dreadful calamities overtook the whole Jewish nation; indeed, the whole face of the world was soon afterwards entirely changed. We may conclude the judgment in the spiritual world to have been finished at the Lord's ascension: and thirty years after this event, the troubles broke out in Judea, which issued in the destruction of Jerusalem, the desolation of the whole country, and the end of the national existence of the Jews. It is to be expected, that the changes in the natural world, which is the world of effects, must be some time subsequent to the changes from which they proceed in the spiritual world, which is the world of causes: and from this example it would appear as if about thirty years were the period, in which a judgment in the spiritual world begins to give rise to corresponding judgments in the world of nature.

Now as we evidently see, that, sooner or later, such judgments in the spiritual world, have, in all former instances, been followed with great troubles in the natural world, we may reasonably conclude, that the performance in the spiritual world of the last judgment of all, would in due time, be followed by the usual visitations in this scene of existence.

Have then any visitations that may probably be supposed, by their magnitude and extraordinary character, to have had such an origin, been experienced, within the last half century, by the nations of Christendom? for to them, more particularly, as forming the professing church, must such judgments belong. Do not the recollections of every person who has lived so long immediately rush forward with an affirmative answer? In the wars, and other dreadful calamities, which began with, and rose out of, the French revolution, has not every serious observer of passing events noted features very different from those which attended the wars and convulsions of former times, — of all times later than the first full establishment of Christianity? Will he not allow them to have been such as are fully commensurate with the ideas suggested by the “distress of nations and perplexity, causing men's hearts to fail them for fear,” announced by the Lord as among the signs of his Second Coming? which coming, we have seen, in the natural world, is a consequenc

of the judgment performed in the spiritual. There was one feature in those contests so entirely peculiar, that it well deserves to be particularly noted; and that is, that the war at last raged in every nation on the whole face of the globe that bears the Christian name; a circumstance which never occurred before since Christianity began. Not only did Europe, from west to east, from north to south, — from France to Russia, and from Naples to Sweden, — heave the billows of her population against each other in more enormous masses than were ever before assembled for the purpose of mutual destruction; but the American world, where the religion of Europe had been transplanted, was equally seized with the destroying mania; till from one extremity to the other of that vast continent, — from Canada to Chili, — the flames of war raged with as great violence, in proportion to the number of the people, as in the western hemisphere. In Asia and Africa too, wherever Christians had planted colonies, the demons of carnage were let loose; whilst, likewise, the waters of every sea were swelled with human blood, poured into it with a profusion beyond all that had ever, in former ages, discolored its waves. Never, before, since the Christian religion was vouchsafed from heaven to be a blessing to mankind, was the whole mass of its professors thus raised by a simultaneous impulse, and arrayed against one another; as if they had all agreed as one man, while disagreeing in every thing else, to disown the empire of the Prince of Peace: never indeed before, since the world began, was any war excited, which deluged the surface of the globe with such wide-spread desolation. Posterity will read of the events which the elder portion of the present generation have witnessed, with greater wonder, than that with which we in our childhood used to read of the innumerable hosts of Xerxes and the exploits of the Greek and Roman conquerors: all the surprising histories of antiquity will appear but records of insignificance, when compared with the history of our times. There have, it is true, been wars in all former ages; and if the late tremendous series of conflicts had been of a common description, I should not think of urging them as an argument on this occasion: but if all must allow them to be of a totally unprecedented character, my readers cannot think that I press them too far, in calling upon them to refer such events to an adequate interior cause. What adequate cause of such wonders can be assigned, but some great convulsion in the moral and spiritual world, displaying itself in corresponding events in the world of nature? what, in fact, but the performance of a judgment there, whence flow, as a necessary consequence, natural judgments here?

And if the war was of so astonishing a character, what have been its effects upon the states of Christendom? During its continuance, repeatedly, several were swept from the map of Europe in a single campaign: and though the most considerable were restored at the peace, it was with such great alterations, both in their internal polity and external relations, that it is strictly correct to say, that the entire face of the European, yea, of the whole Christian commonwealth, has been completely changed. To apply the prophetic phrase in the sense which commentators usually assign to it;—the former heaven and earth of every state of Christendom have passed away; and they have been, with scarce an exception, so entirely new-modelled, that they have received, politically, a new heaven and earth in their place.

Now it may be observed as at least a remarkable coincidence, that the troubles which have had so extraordinary a career and termination, broke out at exactly the same distance of time after the date assigned by Swedenborg for the performance of the Last Judgment in the spiritual world, and of which he published his account in the year 1758, as that which intervened between the conclusion of the judgment performed by the Lord while in the world and the troubles which led to the destruction of Jerusalem.


But if the political changes experienced by Christendom have been so great, how has it fared with her ecclesiastical constitutions? Are we not here particularly struck with the change which has been effected, almost before our eyes, in the state of the Papal Power, once so terrific and irresistible? It is a fact acknowledged by the Protestant interpreters of Scripture (and indeed the features of the portrait are so plain, that nothing but strong prejudice can close the mental eye against a recognition of the original), that the great harlot, whose name is mystical Babylon (Rev. xvii.), is a personification of the Roman Catholic religion: consequently, the judgment denounced upon her (chaps. xvii. and xviii.) must denote, primarily, according to our view of the nature of the Last Judgment, the removal from the intermediate region of the spiritual world to the regions of despair, of those who were confirmed in the evils of that religion: that is, of those who made religion a pretext for establishing their own dominion over the minds and bodies of men. Now the consequence of such a judgment in the spiritual world, must be, the diminution of the power of such persons in this world, and the loosening of the influence of that religion over men's minds. Do we not then behold manifest proofs, which multiply around us continually, that Babylon, even in this world, has received her judgment; and, cons

quently, that the Last Judgment in the spiritual world, which is the cause from which the other is an effect, has been performed? The Roman Catholic religion, so far as it consists in the holding of certain doctrines and practicing of certain forms of worship, may probably continue for ages; just as the Jewish religion, though the Jewish church has long since undergone its judgment both in the spiritual and the natural worlds, continues to this day; but the Romish religion as to that essential part of it which procures for it in the divine Word the name of Babylon, — that is, considered as a system for tyrannizing over men's minds by the prostitution of sacred things for that purpose,* — has received its final judgment, and never can become formidable any more. We have not, indeed, heard for ages, — in fact, not since the Protestants succeeded in fully establishing their independence, — of any attempt on the part of the Popes to exercise the power, which they formerly claimed, of dethroning princes and transferring at pleasure their dominions to others: still, such a dissolution of their power as is included in the denunciation, “Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen,” was an event reserved for our times. The influence of the Romish hierarchy remained very great, in all the countries which continued to profess that religion, till within a recent period. We have seen the Pope himself dragged from his throne, and degraded into a mere tool of the ambition of Napoleon; and though he was afterwards restored by the allied sovereigns from motives of policy, yet is he shorn of his beams: his influence is annihilated; and he now sits in *St. Peter's Chair* (as they call it) more as a puppet than a prince. His desires may perhaps be as capacious as ever; and to promote their aims he has restored the order of the Jesuits, formerly the right hand of the papal power; but never can he restore the causes from which that order derived its efficiency. The spirit and soul of Jesuitism are gone, in the removal from their immediate connection with the human race of those who constituted Babylon in the spiritual world; and hence, however good may be the will of the Pope's new myrmidons, being no longer supported by the same influence from the world of causes, they never can revive much more of the old Jesuits than the name. Thus the restoration of the Pope to his throne is by no means synonymous with the restoration of his power. The spell which bound the minds of men to his sway, has been broken, and can never be renewed. We are continually hearing of new circumstances which demonstrate, that his authority is no longer much respected, even by nations which continue to

* That this is the true signification of Babylon throughout the Scriptures, may be seen in *the Plenary Inspiration*, &c., pp. 361—381.

profess his religion. The events of the last few years in Spain, Portugal, and Italy, evince that, by great numbers, in those countries, once the chief seats of his influence, it is now entirely despised; and the new states of South America, the inhabitants of which were so long among the most devoted slaves of the Roman See, have shown a disposition, though since temporarily checked, to follow up their rejection of civil with the abolition of ecclesiastical tyranny, and, by allowing freedom of worship, to give the fatal blow to priestly domination. Who would have expected ever to behold an accredited envoy from Mexico making a speech at a Bible Society's meeting,* avowing it to be the general wish of his countrymen to read the Scriptures in their own language, and their joint conviction, that civil and religious liberty are as essential to the welfare of a people, as are, to the support of life, the two gases which compose the air we breathe? Even the priests of those countries seem resolved to be *popish* priests no longer; for, in contradiction to a main characteristic of that hierarchy, many of them have distinguished themselves amongst the most active promoters of information and general improvement. Here are new moral phenomena indeed. Evident tokens are everywhere springing up, evincing, that the pretension on the part of any fallible man to the power of opening and shutting heaven at pleasure, which has been the grand engine by the use of which the Roman pontiffs attained such extraordinary influence, will soon be scouted as ridiculous through every country of Christendom, and that men will soon everywhere wonder by what strange infatuation their fathers could have submitted to such palpable arrogance and blasphemy. The cause of that infatuation, according to our views, was, that multitudes of those who, in this world, had promoted the Romish ecclesiastical corruptions, — of priests and monks and their adherents, — had established themselves in the intermediate region of the spiritual world, acting as clouds by which the light that is ever in the effort of flowing from heaven into the human mind was in great part intercepted, and instead of it were substituted such influences as tended to uphold the domination which such spirits, and their like in this world, affect: and the reason why such infatuation prevails no longer, is, as we are convinced, because, by the Last Judgment, those spirits are removed, and light from heaven, thus gaining new access to the minds of men, exposes, as one of its first effects, the absurdity of such pretensions. Can any one look at the wonderful change, in this respect, which is every where experienced, and not acknowledge the cause which we assign for it to be the most worthy,

* The annual meeting at Norwich, Sept. 1825.



yea, the only adequate one, that can be conceived? Can any one, on its being suggested to him, fail to recognise, in these surprising events, plain signs that the Last Judgment is accomplished?

Here, also it may be observed, we have a clue that would guide to a sound decision of the famous Catholic question. The opponents of Catholic emancipation consist of those who draw their opinion on the subject from theology and ecclesiastical history; who thence know what are the tenets of that religion, which a church that professes to be infallible cannot explicitly revoke, and what are the enormities to which those tenets have lent their sanction. These resist the Catholic claims under the apprehension, that the moment Protestants cease to tread the Catholics under their feet, they will mount over their heads, and will, sooner or later, relume the fires of Smithfield. Nor do those who take this view of the question merit the ridicule which is sometimes thrown upon them. If they are practically wrong, they are not wrong without a reason. Their opinion is founded on the ample experience of former times. It would unquestionably have been the right opinion much less than a hundred years ago: and as they know nothing of the great spiritual cause which has intervened to invalidate the deductions from ancient experience, it is not to be wondered at, if, dwelling as their thoughts do upon positive facts, they fear to trust to the altered state of feeling which is everywhere apparent. On the other hand, the advocates of Catholic emancipation consist of those who allow themselves to be carried along by the spirit of the present times. Though unacquainted with the true cause, they *feel* that the facts on which their opponent's arguments are grounded, are grown obsolete. They perceive that the state of the human mind, among Catholics as well as Protestants, has undergone a great change, and that were the Romish priesthood again to urge the pretensions to unlimited dominion which made them once so formidable, and which lay at the source of all the wicked deeds which they perpetrated in the name of religion, it would only deprive them of the share of influence which they yet retain, and make them universally, among Catholics as well as Protestants, objects of execration. Practically, as we conceive, these are right, though they know not the reason. They see so plainly one of the consequences of the Last Judgment, as to be willing to legislate upon it, though not aware of its true cause. And is not the extent to which this acknowledgment of one effect of the Last Judgment is forcing itself upon the minds of men, another effect of that judgment, and an additional argument that it has been performed?*

* The above paragraph was in the first edition of this work: the legislature has since acted in conformity with what it suggests.

But not only do the effects in the natural world of the accomplishment of the Judgment in the spiritual display themselves in the way of visitations, but also in direct dispensations of mercy: for the sake of which, indeed, all divine judgments are performed. The calamities with which they are accompanied, are only designed to remove obstructions out of the way, and to make room for the reception of the benefits which the Divine Judge ever has in view. If the wicked who occupied the intermediate region of the spiritual world, were, by the judgment there, cast into hell, it was, that the good who were mixed with them, or reserved in the lower parts of the spiritual world on account of them, might be raised into heaven; and also, that the divine efflux of spiritual life and light, which they intercepted in its passage to men on earth, might have free course: in like manner, if Christendom has been visited with tremendous troubles, as a first consequence of the performance of the judgment in the spiritual world, it is that a second consequence may follow, and that the divine outpouring of spiritual life and light may produce the blessings for which it is bestowed. If then we see, in the world around us, marks, in this way, of the activity of this divine efflux, they are sure signs that the judgment in the spiritual world has been performed. In what we have already noticed, even, such marks are palpable. But how evident is the change, and *that* a change for the better, which, in many other respects likewise, has passed upon the state of mankind;—a change so obvious to all, that we can scarcely take up a magazine, or newspaper, or any new publication whatever, without finding it adverted-to with admiration! How constantly are some of the features of this mighty alteration dwelt upon, in almost every public meeting, political or religious? I have asked above,* “Does not every voice confess that we are living in a most extraordinary era of the world? Is not every mind impressed with the conviction, that there is something almost preternatural in the character of the present times?” And I had asked further, respecting the improvements everywhere springing up, whether they are not “continually calling forth, from every quarter, exclamations of surprise, and expanding every bosom with the hope, that the opening of a new and happier day than the world has ever before seen, is now dawning on mankind?” Every reader who is at all acquainted with the modern press, or who has made any observation on passing events for himself, will be ready to give these questions an affirmative answer. Multitudes of extracts from periodical and other publications, returning such an answer, might be easily adduced; but their frequency makes it

* P. 35.

unnecessary to cite them : I will only take, as a sample, a short passage from the prospectus of a new literary undertaking,* which came into my hands while writing this Section, and which is, in part, a perfect echo of my above-cited questions : “The most unthinking, as well as the most prejudiced,” says the well-informed writer of this paper, “must be struck with the fact, that the period in which we live is extraordinary and momentous. Amongst the great body of the people an unparalleled revolution is at work : they have awoke from that ignorance in which they had slept for ages, and have sprung up in their new character of thinking beings, qualified to inquire and to discuss ; and despising both the despotism and the bigotry that would prohibit or impede their improvement. — The intellectual spirit is moving upon the chaos of minds, which ignorance and necessity have thrown into collision and confusion ; and the result will be, a new creation. Nature (to use the nervous language of an old writer) ‘will be melted down and re-coined ;’ and all will be bright and beautiful.” It is thus that every attentive observer is impressed by the character of the present times. Consider then my reflecting readers, whether so great an effect can be without a cause ! And to what cause can it, with any degree of reason, be assigned, but to that mighty change in the interior sphere of human minds effected by the performance of the Last Judgment in the spiritual world, and to the pouring thence of new energies from heaven into the awakening faculties of man ?

Let us here ask, How might such a pouring of energies from heaven, and of light thence, into the minds of men in general, be expected, in the first instance, to operate ? What the writer of the above quotation calls “the intellectual spirit moving upon the chaos of minds,” is what the Scripture calls “the Spirit of God moving upon the face of the waters.” The ultimate object of the divine movement is, that man may be made in the image and likeness of God ; in other words, that man should rise to the full dignity of his nature, as the recipient, without perverting them, of love and wisdom from God ; for it is only such a being as this, — a being in whom the spiritual faculties as well as the natural endowments belonging to human nature are properly developed, — that the Word of God emphatically denominates *a man*. Nevertheless, though it is as a spiritual being that man is last perfected, it is as a natural being that he first comes into existence ; and his natural faculties, from the lowest to the highest of them, are successively unfolded, before his spiritual ones are opened. Hence the operations of the Divine Spirit, in Genesis, consisted in calling into birth all the

* The London Encyclopædia.

lower parts of the creation, beginning from the lowest of all and advancing to the higher, before man himself was produced ; all which inferior objects are exact images of the various faculties that belong to the natural part of the human constitution ; while that which is called *man*, — the image and likeness of God, — is man considered as to his spiritual part, — a receptacle of love and wisdom from God ; — to which it is given to reign over the lower powers. Such was the order in which the Divine Spirit proceeded at first : such then is the order in which the new out-pouring of divine influences might be expected to operate now : — and accordingly, such is the order in which it is now working its wonders anew among mankind.

Hence, then it is that we see, in every direction, such astonishing improvements in whatever has for its object the well-being of man as to the natural part of his constitution. Look at the extraordinary manner in which the science and practice of agriculture have, during the last thirty or forty years, been advanced ; which has been such, that although the population of the globe, especially the Christian part of it, has increased in a ratio beyond all that was ever known before (a circumstance which itself is a most striking result of the increased energy with which life, from the first Source of life, is flowing into nature), the earth has not proved incapable of supplying food for the increasing multitude, but has poured forth her productions with corresponding profusion : proclaiming the fact, that the divine command requiring her to bring forth her increase, — in other words, the divine energy producing it, — has gone forth anew. Behold, again, the wonderful manner, in which manufacturing skill and power have been augmented ; — the astonishing perfection given to machinery ; which is such, that wood and metal appear to be informed with human intelligence, whilst they are actuated by a force imparted by inanimate agents immensely beyond any that could be yielded by animal strength. Hereby every production of human ingenuity required for the necessities, comforts, or convenience of man, has been multiplied to an extent which not long since would have been deemed impossible ; and so reduced at the same time in price as to be made attainable by all : in which, again, we behold a new out-pouring of divine energies, rendering, in an unprecedented manner, the hands of men productive. Look, also, at the amazing improvement in many other things ; such as the banishment of night from our streets by the introduction of gas-lights, and the splendor added by the same invention to our saloons and public edifices ; or the amelioration in ways and roads, and in the facilities for conveying goods and travelers by land and by water ; which are such that, in a

great degree, as to its separating power, space is annihilated, and the remotest parts of the globe are brought into vicinity. Here, again, who can fail to see some extraordinary agency at work, giving an unwonted impulse to human energies, and exhibiting in its extreme or lowest effects, the increased action of the world of life and activity.

But if we proceed to a slight view of some of the moral phenomena of the times, greater wonders, if possible, will demand our admiration. Observe, then, the surprising advance, on the one hand, of science; and, on the other, the universal increase of the desire for knowledge, combined with the extraordinary multiplication of the means for its diffusion. Since the time at which we believe the Last Judgment, in the spiritual world to have taken place, every branch of Science has been improved to a most unexpected extent, whilst many new ones have been added, and others have assumed a form which makes them virtually new: thus Geology, whose discoveries are so highly interesting, whose conclusions are so momentous, and whose practical uses are so eminent, is entirely the offspring of modern times: whilst Chemistry, which is so continually astonishing us with fresh wonders, has undergone, in our times, a change equivalent to a new creation.* Nor is the progress

* Speaking in company in the year 1825, of the great modern improvements in Science as one of the effects of the light flowing from the spiritual world in consequence of the accomplishment of the Last Judgment, a scientific friend, who was struck with the idea, was so kind as to send me, soon afterwards, the following list of

“Improvements in Natural Science made about or subsequently to the era of the Last Judgment, 1757.

“The distinct classification of natural beings and substances of all kinds — the determinate recognition of their respective specific identity, and denotation of that identity by names, — which have effected so many subordinate improvements in science, were not made until about the above era. — The Linnæan system of natural history, which was materially concerned in the improvement just noticed, was promulgated from about 1735 to 1773, and came into full reception about the latter period or perhaps somewhat before. — The doctrine of the regular succession of the stratified masses constituting the crust of the globe, forming the foundation of the modern science of Geology, was first delivered distinctly, and to a considerable degree demonstrated, by Lehman in 1756, and by Mitchell in 1760. — Five primary planets, and eight or ten secondary planets or satellites, have been discovered since 1757. No addition to the former class of heavenly bodies has been made *from time immemorial*; and none, I think, to the latter, for a century before; but of this I am not certain. — Many departments of mathematical and physical science which had scarcely any existence before, and some which were absolutely unknown, have risen to great importance since 1757. Among the former are several branches of mathematical analysis, which, in the investigation of problems in physics, have nearly superseded the old and tedious geometrical methods. The

that has been made by elegant literature of all kinds less rapid and extraordinary ; whilst, of late, particularly, a great proportion

sciences of mineralogy, chemistry, (see below), and electricity, have assumed a form since 1757, altogether distinct from that which they bore in the previous period. It would seem indeed that a new *discrete* degree was developed in the sciences at that era ; a marked character of which was the improvement first noticed in this list. A great variety of truths, merely suspected in the latter part of the seventeenth century and former part of the eighteenth, were seen in the clearest light after the above era . The entire science of galvanism, or Voltaic electricity, which has exerted so great an influence on that of chemistry, as well in theory as in practice, and given rise to so many discoveries in it, has arisen since the era of the last judgment : it was absolutely unknown before. The true nature of thunder and lightning was discovered about 1750, by Dr. Franklin. Is it in *correspondence* [thunder and lightning being used as figures, in Scripture, of the revelation from heaven of Divine Truth] that this discovery should have been made at the same time that the spiritual sense of the Scriptures was being revealed to mankind ? [The first volume of Swedenborg's theological works was printed in 1749].

"The steam engine was invented (as a machine for use) about 1700, or a year or two before : but it received its grand improvements about 1764. The application of iron as a principal article in civil and naval architecture, did not take place until after 1757. It was employed in arms and machinery for ages before.

"The following are a few of the particular discoveries in chemistry since the year 1757 : — The constitution of the atmosphere. — The composition of water. — The existence of latent or combined heat (that is, of certain phenomena referred by philosophers to such an origin : great fallacies, no doubt, are involved, in the prevailing doctrines on the subject ; but these phenomena were unknown, in the science of heat, before). — The radiation of terrestrial heat ; that is, the passage into space in right lines of the heat obtained from artificial sources, independently of the solar beams ; as well as of the heat any substance has previously imbibed from the sun. By this property every substance in nature emulates the sun, as to his diffusion of heat. — The doctrine of the mutual relations of the regular geometrical forms assumed by almost every substance, or the science of *crystallography*. The *doctrine of the definite proportions* in which bodies mutually combine : by which every substance in nature, whether simple or compound, is shown to combine in a quantity represented by a *certain number*, which number represents the substance *in all its relations* ; called the *atomic theory*. — There is some difference of opinion amongst chemists, as to what truly constitutes the *metallic nature* ; but there are probably about *thirty-nine* metals, of which *twenty-four* have been discovered since 1757. How immense an addition to the science this is, is evinced by the facts, that not one new metal was discovered between 1541 and 1732, and only four between 1732 and 1757. — The polarization of light, discovered within these few years, forms a more important addition to the science of optics, than any single improvement it ever received.

"It is of course to be understood that most of the new doctrines in science to which a date has been here assigned, did not come into full reception in the minds of philosophers until a few years subsequent to their date.

of the new works which appear have a moral aim in view, and are adapted to assist in promoting the best interests of mankind.* Whence can such an increase of natural light result, but from a new out-pouring of light from heaven, of which, when received in the natural faculties of the human mind, improvements in science are the natural offspring? And while every kind of mental food is thus provided in such abundance, the appetite for its appropriation is not less remarkable; and institutions which have for their object to produce this appetite, and to supply it with the means of obtaining satisfaction, are every where springing up. The discovery of the systems of Bell and Lancaster, followed as it has been, by various other improvements, has formed a new era in the science of education; the advantages of which are now imparted to multitudes at a less expense than was formerly incurred in bestowing them on a few; and, by establishments having this for their object, those advantages are being diffused, not only throughout this favored

* I cannot here refrain from citing the following just and striking remarks, on this subject, from the *Literary Gazette* of Nov. 12, 1825, which met my eye almost while writing the above (for the first edition). "— Even the cheapest little sheet that issues from the press is good of its kind. Fifteen years ago — ten years ago, it was hardly possible to lift up a periodical paper without pollution. The press teemed with what was desperate in politics, destructive in morals, ruinous in social relations, and horrible in religion: the ignorant were deluded, the irresolute perverted, the firm shaken, by almost every act of this tremendous engine." — This however, like the political convulsions which have shaken the world, was equally a consequence of the increased influence poured from the spiritual world, and from the Lord himself, into the world of nature, which is received by every one according to his state, and at the presence, therefore, of which, the evil bring forth without reserve what they before strove to conceal; and it was thus that, in the spiritual world itself, the evil were constrained to discover themselves at the period of the judgment. This effect of the wonderful operation appears now, however, in a great measure, to be passing away. To continue our quotation: "The change, now, is as delightful as it is extraordinary. Except in the newspapers, there is not one among fifty periodical publications which is not well disposed, and useful to every rank in life, — not one in hundreds of an injurious tendency to the best interests of mankind. And we do not speak of works in extensive circulation, and of course well known; but of multitudes which fill their narrow circle only, but fill it in a way which half a century ago would have attracted general applause. In excepting the newspapers, too, we would be understood as not undervaluing those powerful, and, when rightly conducted, admirable productions. The extent and variety of their information is astonishing; the style in which their original remarks are written, and the character they display, are such as challenge almost unmixed admiration, when we consider the circumstances under which they are brought forth." — "Consider," says the divine prophet, in reference to the present times, — "Consider the fig-tree: when his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that the summer is nigh."

country, but nearly through the whole globe. To these laudable establishments, the new and admirable institution of Infant Schools is becoming a powerful auxiliary ; which, by commencing the culture of the human mind at its first dawn, withdraws it from the consequences of parental neglect and the contagion of parental depravity, and must effectually prevent ignorance and barbarism from being, much longer, the necessary inheritance of the poor. Nor is the love of knowledge and of diffusing it, which in the present age is so conspicuous, satisfied with providing for the instruction of the young. The man desires to perfect what the child began ; and thus Mechanics' Institutions, and Literary Societies of various kinds, have been founded, and are spreading through the land : whilst by publications containing the elements of science in a cheap and popular form, and by cheap editions of literary works of established reputation, intellectual cultivation, of every species, is made accessible to all. To all, from the infant to the man, and from the peasant to the prince, the flood-gates of knowledge are set open : and the nations rush eagerly to imbibe the mind-informing streams. Can we behold such truly astonishing changes in the intellectual condition of mankind, without referring them to a spiritual cause ? Can we fail to see in them the effect of a new outpouring of light and life from heaven, preparing the way, by raising and cultivating the rational faculties of man for his spiritual improvement ?

Allow me here to add a passage from a high-church publication, which fell under my observation while this was going through the press,* and which evinces, that those effects of the Last Judgment that we are here noticing, have powerfully forced themselves upon the attention even of those, whose natural prejudices and interests (I do not say this invidiously) most indispose them for admitting their reality, and even incline to regard them as an evil. The following strong statement is from the *Quarterly Theological Review* : "† "It is now too late to press objections, be they strong or weak, against universal education — against that (if we may speak chemically) hyperoxygenated passion for imparting knowledge, which is so prevalent in our times. We are not left to argue and debate upon what might have been better or worse ; we must act upon what we find in operation. *The fountains of the great deep have been broken up, and a deluge of information — theological, scientific, and civil — is carrying all before it, filling up the valleys, and scaling the mountain tops.* A spirit of inquiry has gone

* In the first edition.

† No. IV. p. 399. This work is since incorporated with the *British Critic*

forth, and sits brooding on the mind of man. The effect may be good or it may be bad ; much will depend on right regulation and direction.”—Wherefore the writer presently adds, “ Let the objectors to general education tell us it is a fierce forerunner of anarchy, insubordination, and infidelity, a whirlwind whose desolating effects we shall live to rue. In reply we would say : Be it what they please ; it is for the Clergy of the National Church to ride that whirlwind, and direct the storm ; to moderate and guide its force, that like every other *apparent evil* permitted by Providence it may conduce to some good end.”—Can anything stronger than this half-reluctant but most decided testimony to the truths we are advocating, be conceived ? They who view the event with trembling, nevertheless acknowledge, that “ the fountains of the great deep have been broken up ! ” — who can doubt, that it has been effected by a similar divine interference to that which was exerted in the days of Noah ? — It was, we may also add, exactly in the spirit of these remarks, that the Bishop of London,* in his famous Charge, some years since warned his clergy, that if they wish, in these days of rapidly increasing knowledge, to retain the consideration they enjoyed in former times, they must allow the current, since it cannot be resisted, to carry them along with it, and be careful, by their increased attainments, still to keep in advance of the general knowledge of the age. This is excellent advice : but it will not be sufficient, unless the clergy allow the improvements to be extended to their Articles and Liturgy. The advancing intelligence of the age must renovate the doctrines they preach as well as embellish their mode of preaching them : they must permit the energies which are now operating from heaven for the enlightening of the human mind, to enlighten it in the most important points of all : and then they will retain their ancient consideration unimpaired, and will be respected by all as the heaven-commissioned ministers of heaven-born truths. Thus only will they be qualified “ to ride that whirlwind, and direct the storm.”

Nor is it only of natural knowledge that the streams are thus set flowing : by that truly extraordinary, that greatest of modern benevolent establishments, the British and Foreign Bible Society, we also behold dispensed, with a copiousness unknown to former ages, the streams of salvation. The formation of such a society is itself a phenomenon ; and its operations have been a series of wonders. When we behold men of all Christian sects, abandoning their particular differences, unite to distribute the Scriptures free from the glosses and corrupt expositions which most sects have appended to them ; who can fail to discern

* Dr. Howley, now Archbishop of Canterbury.

in the work the mighty finger of God? When we see, by the exertions of this Society, not only all Christendom supplied with the inestimable treasure, but almost all the nations of the earth, the multitudes of a thousand tongues, who never knew before that God had given such a revelation of his will, enabled to read the Word of God in their own language, and presented, in their own languages, with the Word of God to read; who can help exclaiming, "This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes?" Who can fail to discover in it the effects of a new divine influence, providing, more extensively than ever, the means of human salvation? Nor the efforts which are making by Missionary Societies, and the success which, in some instances, has attended them, unworthy of being noticed in this sketch of the signs of the present times. If the theology which the Missionaries teach is not such as *we* can regard as pure, its effects upon the degraded idolator are highly beneficial: and who can fail to recognize the divine energies which are now pouring forth for the improvement of the human race, when he beholds, among their results, the Hottentot reclaimed from his filth, and the Otaheitan from his impurity, — the barbarian brought within the circle of civilized humanity, — the savage elevated to the man!

Here, I think, I may close this Section. Were I to attempt to enumerate all the symptoms of the mighty change that has taken place in the state of mankind, I might write a volume on this subject alone. Allow me then ye Candid and Reflecting, to request your serious attention to the instances which have been adduced, the number of which your own recollections will readily augment. Is not every one of them, taken singly, of sufficient magnitude to excite surprise, and to awaken serious meditation on the subject of its cause? But when such hosts of them press on our notice together, are we not compelled to refer the cause to something of a very extraordinary nature indeed? Here are multitudes of phenomena which every observer sees and owns; and every one who observes them owns likewise, that "the most unthinking, as well as the most prejudiced, must be struck with the fact, that the period in which we live is extraordinary and momentous;" and not only, that "amongst the great body of the people an unparalleled revolution is at work," — that "the fountains of the great deep have been broken up," — but that the main seat of the revolution is in the mental part of man, — "that the intellectual spirit is moving upon the chaos of minds," — that "it sits brooding on the mind of man," — and this with such energy as to authorize the expectation, that "nature will be melted down and re-coined." Where, I repeat, can the cause of such a simultaneous alteration in human

minds be looked for, but in the world of minds itself, — in other terms, in the spiritual world, with which man, as to his mind, is most intimately connected? And what change could there be adequate to the production of so great a change as we are witnessing here, but the performance of the Last Judgment, — the entirely new state which is thence induced on the intermediate region of the spiritual world, the seat of man's most immediate spiritual association, — and the consequent outpouring from heaven of new streams of light and life into the world of nature? The illustrious Swedenborg, so long ago as the year 1758, declared* that, by the Last Judgment, then just accomplished, spiritual liberty was restored, and the state of servitude and captivity in which men's minds were previously held, in regard to spiritual subjects, was removed; and in the year 1763 he added,† that the efflux of divine energies from heaven into the world, which had been in a great degree intercepted by the presence of those called the dragon and his angels in the intermediate part of the spiritual world, was by their ejection, restored. These assertions were made, when no remarkable effects of the change had yet begun to manifest themselves in the world, and when, consequently, they could not be corroborated by acknowledged facts: but how wonderfully have they thus been corroborated since, and what striking confirmation of them does every day's experience now bring with it! Am I then doing any more than anticipating the suffrage of many of my readers, when I conclude, that our Second Proposition is sufficiently established; — that independently of the assertions of Swedenborg, there are various considerations tending to evince, that the Last Judgment has, in the spiritual world, been performed? Will not all acknowledge, that the spiritual cause thus assigned for the astonishing change in the state of mankind is, at least, likely to be the true one? and since no other can be conceived that is adequate to the effect, will not the Candid admit it to be at least highly probable, that the Last Judgment, so long looked for and so much misunderstood, has, at length, actually been accomplished?

* In his work on the Last Judgment.

† In his Continuation of the former work.

SECTION V.

A HUMAN INSTRUMENT NECESSARY, AND THEREFORE RAISED UP.

PART I.

Swedenborg qualified to be such an Instrument, and not unlikely to be chosen for the purpose.

I MAY now appeal to you, I apprehend, with confidence, my Reflecting and Candid readers, respecting the means by which the great events, considered in our preceding and second Sections, must be communicated to mankind. If it be true that the long expected Last Judgment has at length been performed,—that the long looked-for time of the Lord's second coming has at last arrived,—in what manner would it be reasonable to conclude that the important tidings should be conveyed? Are we to behold a multitude of angels in the air sounding great trumpets, and vocally calling the attention of the world to the crisis which has arrived? In their spiritual, which, as regards this subject, is their only true sense, the prophecies which speak of such an announcement doubtless must be (and we trust have been) accomplished:—from heaven,—that is, from the Lord through heaven,—the divine truths of the Holy Word must be (and we trust have been) discovered anew; for of the revelation, or communication of Divine truth, the sounding of trumpets is in the Word, the expressive symbol:—but if, as I hope, has been sufficiently proved, the second advent of the Lord was not to be of a personal nature; if the scene of the last judgment was not to be in this lower world, any otherwise than as to its effects: it follows, that it was not by a visible exhibition of angels with trumpets that the annunciation was here to be made. Yet, most unquestionably, some annunciation was necessary. The events which have passed in our times, and which are transacting still, upon the theatre of the globe, are indeed such as proclaim, with a voice of thunder, that some most extraordinary operation from the spiritual world upon the world of nature is in action; they are indeed such as demonstrate when looked at under the proper aspect, that the last judgment has been performed, and that the second coming of the Lord is taking place: thus, when the truth is distinctly proclaimed, they bear witness to it in the most decisive manner:

but they require a human announcer to give their loud voice a distinctly 'speaking tongue. The second coming of the Lord, also, as we have seen, is mainly effected by the re-discovery of the momentous and saving truths contained in his holy Word: among the signs of the times which we have noticed, are the loosening of the hold which erroneous sentiments had taken on the minds of men, a general change in men's modes of thinking, and such an alteration in the state of the human mind as indicates a preparation for the reception of juster views of divine truth than have heretofore prevailed: but still it is obviously requisite that the truth itself should be explicitly announced, and, of consequence, that a Human Instrument should be raised up for that purpose.

This appears to be the evident dictate both of reason and of necessity: and to these is added the confirming suffrage of experience. Never did a similar crisis in the history of the divine economy occur before, but human agency was employed to make it known. Prior to the flood, the divine purpose was communicated to Noah; who, as tradition reports, warned, though in vain, his abandoned contemporaries; whence he is called by an Apostle "a preacher of righteousness."* When the time had arrived in which Jehovah proposed to verify to the Israelites the promise made to their fathers of putting them in possession of Canaan, a band of angels was not sent to announce the fact to the whole nation, but God revealed himself to Moses, and commissioned him to bear the tidings to his brethren. Even when the Lord Jesus Christ appeared personally on earth, and when, if ever, it might be supposed that merely human agency might have been dispensed with, he did not show himself to the people, till John the Baptist had announced his approach, and had proclaimed the kingdom of heaven to be at hand. Surely then, at his second coming, which was not to be a personal one, a Human Herald must be altogether indispensable. Had it occurred in the first ages, when Christians were looking daily, though mistakenly, for the second coming of their Lord, and when they had not yet learned to regard such an interposition as impossible, the appearance of such a herald would have been hailed with joy: and it surely ought not now to be scouted as ridiculous, by any but those, who, because mankind have lived so long under an economy different from that which prevailed before the introduction of Christianity, — under an economy in which continually repeated missions of divine messengers were not required, — have forgotten that such missions ever existed at all, and that, without them, Christianity itself could not have been established. It is

however, an unquestionable truth, that how long soever the suspension may have lasted, one more example of them *must* be afforded; — one case more *must inevitably* arise, in which, without the employment again of one more such messenger, the last great purpose in the divine economy must fail to take effect, — the last great predictions of holy writ must remain unfulfilled for ever. I cannot, then, think that any of you to whom this Appeal is addressed, — any of the Reflecting of any Denomination whatsoever, — can treat such an occurrence either as impossible or ridiculous: I am sure you will acknowledge, that, at the era of the second coming of the Lord, some Human Instrument or other must be divinely enlightened to declare it, and to communicate the important truths, which at that advent are, as we have seen, to be unfolded to mankind.

Of this branch, then, of the inquiry to be pursued in our present-Section, it must be quite unnecessary to go into any further discussion. That at the crisis which we are supposing and which, as was attempted to be shown in our second and last Sections, there is reason to believe has arrived, a Human Instrument must be necessary, will, I am persuaded, be generally acknowledged: the only question, then, which we have now to consider, is, whether such an Instrument was raised up in the person of the every-way respectable and truly illustrious philosopher and theologian, the Honorable Emanuel Swedenborg.

An intelligent person once asked our author, How he, from a philosopher, became a theologian; to which he answered “In the same manner as, on being called by the Lord, fishermen became apostles.” He added, “That he had himself been a spiritual fisherman from his youth;” which he confirmed by showing, that in the spiritual language, formed of natural images, in which the Scriptures are written, a fisherman means a person who investigates and teaches natural truths, and afterwards spiritual truths, in a rational manner: whence the Lord when he called his first disciples from their nets, said to them, “Follow me, and I will make you *fishers of men*,”* obviously meaning, *instructors of men in the truths which relate to salvation*. His interrogator expressed his satisfaction at this answer by the remark, “That the Lord alone knows of whom to make choice for communicating to mankind the truths to be discovered at his second advent, and whether the suitable Instrument is to be found in the person of a mitred prelate, or of one of his footmen.”† This, certainly, was the judgment

* Matt. iv. 19. Mark i. 17.

† See Swedenborg’s little treatise *On the intercourse between the Soul and the Body*, n. 20.

both of piety and good sense. In the case before us, however, even human reason must concur in the fitness of the choice made by Divine Wisdom. All that is known of the illustrious Swedenborg, points him out as a man in whom was centred every thing that could qualify a human being for such an office.

In his external circumstances, there is nothing that can be objected against the probability of *his* being made the subject of a selection which *must* fall on some one, except that he was not a priest, or a minister of religion by profession; but if this objection may with any appear to bear some shadow of reason, a little reflection must convince every one that it carries none of the reality. On what former occasion did the Divine Being first publish a new dispensation of his grace and truth, by the instrumentality of any who had been ministers of the former? Though Moses was the son-in-law of a gentile priest, and, from the necessity of the case, acted as a priest himself in the inauguration of Aaron into the holy office, he did not previously, nor ever professionally, belong to the order. In like manner, it was not from the priests of the Jewish Church that the Lord selected his apostles. The Baptist indeed, was the son of a priest, and entitled, by the Levitical constitutions, to exercise the office himself; but when he arrived at the age fixed for that purpose by the law, instead of taking up the function by ministering in the temple, he began in the wilderness to proclaim the advent of the Messiah: and the circumstance of his origin, instead of depriving his character of parallelism with that of Swedenborg, really, if a coincidence so unimportant be worth remarking, makes it more perfect; since Swedenborg also was the son of a priest, the excellence of whose character is the subject of encomium with all who have had occasion to mention him, — of a modern Zacharias, who, with Elizabeth his wife, “walked in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless,” — the good Bishop Swedberg.

But Swedenborg's intrinsic qualifications, moral and intellectual, for the discharge of such an office, were such as all must allow to be appropriate in the highest degree. In him were united the utmost integrity, piety, and innocence of manners, with the most comprehensive understanding and most extensive attainments in knowledge. The former excellences, it will generally be admitted, were necessary to prepare him for his office at all; and without the latter, it will easily be seen, he could not have discharged it with effect. He stands not in the character of a new *prophet*, in the sense usually applied to that term, and as he has sometimes been denominated in derision.

nor in that of a writer of additions to the Word of God, as he has also been maliciously represented. The Lord engages, at his second coming to appear “in the clouds of heaven,” — or in the outward covering of his Word, which is its literal sense, — “with power and great glory,” — with the full evidence and clear brilliancy of the genuine truth of his Word, to which the letter is the covering. This could not have been accomplished by sending a prophet, again to speak in the enigmatical, and never, without special illumination, clearly understood language of prophecy; but only by raising up a teacher, who, under the influence of divine guidance and illumination, should be able to see in the Scriptures, and to comprehend in his own mind, the sublime truths he was to teach, and to communicate them in a manner suited to their depth and importance. Hence the necessity that the Human Instrument made choice of on this occasion should be a man of learning. Something similar occurred at the first promulgation of Christianity: for the apostles were not *all* ignorant men. To diffuse the knowledge of the gospel among the Jews, persons possessing nothing beyond common Jewish attainments, but guided by the Spirit of God, were competent: but when “a chosen vessel” was required “to bear the Lord’s name before the Gentiles, and kings, and to the children of Israel”^{*} scattered among the Gentiles, — to carry the gospel to the learned and polished nations of those times, — a man was miraculously called to the work, who, having been born and long resident at Tarsus, a polite Grecian city, was as much skilled in the learning of the Greeks, as, by having been brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, he was versed in the doctrines of the Jews. Much more was it necessary that, in this age of the general diffusion of natural knowledge, the Human Instrument for first communicating the truths to be made known at the Lord’s second coming, should stand upon a par with the first of his contemporaries in scientific attainment; especially as, while all the general doctrines he was to unfold were to be far more clear, and more easily intelligible, than those commonly received at present as the doctrines of Christianity, some of the truths to be discovered were to be of the most profound kind, requiring for their full development the highest talent for abstruse investigation, and for their perfect comprehension the most exalted powers of the best cultivated mind.

In Swedenborg, every requisite gift was centred. Well imbued, first under the tuition of his learned father, and then at the University of Upsal, with all the usual elements of a learned education, he for a time cultivated classical literature with diligence and success. He then applied himself to the most

^{*} Acts ix. 15..

solid and certain of the natural sciences, and not only by domestic study and by correspondence with foreign literati, but by repeated travels in all the scientifically enlightened parts of Europe, — in Germany, Italy, France, Holland, and England, — he made himself thoroughly acquainted with all the knowledge of his time and was admitted, by general consent, to a station among the first philosophers of the age. As, in the midst of the distinctions with which he was honored by his compeers in learning and by sovereign princes,* he never forgot for a moment his original piety and modesty, — his scientific writings constantly breathing the humble and devotional spirit of a true Christian philosopher, — the acquisitions he made in natural science must be acknowledged to have formed an admirable preparation, and a most suitable basis, for the apprehension and explication of the spiritual truths which he was to be the Instrument for unfolding. Between the book of nature, read by the eye of humble intelligence, and the Word of God, every one intuitively perceives there must be an exact agreement; and spiritual views can never be so little likely to partake of delusion, as when they take for their foundation a copious store of sound natural science. An extensive acquaintance with the knowledge of God in his works, must be the best preparation for a superior perception of the knowledge of God in his Word: and by the former was Swedenborg eminently distinguished.†

Admitting then, — what, we have seen, none will deny, — that at the era of the Lord's second coming, a Human Instrument, to communicate the truths then to be made known, would be necessary; and assuming, — what, also, it is hoped, has at least been shown to be probable, — that that long expected era has at length arrived; sure I am that all the Candid and Reflecting will confess, that no man more likely to be made that Instrument could be found in Christendom, than the man whose qualifications for the office I have here briefly described *A priori*, there is all the probability which such a case admits

* Beside the favors he received from several kings and queens of Sweden he was honored with the friendship of the Duke of Brunswick, at whose court he abode for some time, and who, as a mark of his consideration, defrayed the expense of printing his great philosophical work, the *Regnum Minerale*; which accounts for the elegant form in which it appeared, so superior to the usual productions of the German press. He also received marks of favor from other German princes.

† I have drawn the above account of Swedenborg and his character from the best sources, and shall presently, for the reader's satisfaction, present him with some of my authorities for what I have advanced: but as they occasionally intersperse their notice of the author with remarks on his writings, I reserve them for the next PART of this SECTION.

that the pretensions of the eminent and honorable Emanuel Swedenborg to be received in this character, are well founded.

But to raise this probability into certainty, an examination of the views he has communicated in sustaining the character he claims, would be necessary. To go into this with fulness, would require an extensive survey of his writings; which would demand a work of much greater magnitude than this is intended to be. As noticed in the Introductory Section, I am here compelled to shape my course in the direction marked out by opponents, and am, consequently, confined to the particular explanation and defence of those points, which, in the opinion of our adversaries, it is most difficult to maintain: if then I should succeed in showing reason to believe, that the views and doctrines most objected to are nevertheless true, it surely will be difficult to doubt, that the light by which the illustrious Swedenborg was enabled to discover them, must have had a higher origin than his own mind. I am indeed satisfied, that a most convincing work might be written on the Internal Evidence which the writings of Swedenborg bear to their own truth; and this not only in the great and leading doctrines which they deliver, and which they so scripturally and rationally establish, but in innumerable more minute points, in which they speak to the heart, and experience, and best intelligence, of man. There is no subject of which they treat that they do not lay open in a deeper ground than is done by any other author: in particular, they discover so profoundly and distinctly the inward operations, the interior workings, of the human heart and mind, and unveil man so fully to himself, that no person of reflection can attentively peruse them, without feeling a monitor in his own breast continually responding to their truth. Will it not follow, that a writer who can thus penetrate into the most secret things, and place them in a light which is at once seen to be the true one, must have been the subject of a superior illumination, and must, as he avows, have been admitted to a conscious perception of the things of that world, in which the essences of things lie open? But I am content, for the present, to rest the truth of Swedenborg's pretensions to the divine illumination he professes to have received, in addition to the support they derive from his personal character, upon the evidence of those sentiments of his which are advocated in the various Sections of this Appeal. May I not recur to the view which has been given, in our second Section, of the true nature of the Second Coming of the Lord, as resting on the strongest basis of Scripture and reason? But that view, so different from the hitherto received notions, yet so obviously true, was first advanced by Swedenborg, and was attained by him, because the time for the fulfillment

of the prophecies relating to it had arrived. May I not advert to the view of the Resurrection, supported in our third Section, as presenting the only scriptural and rational conceptions on the subject? Yet this view, though partially seen by many, was, in like manner, first conclusively established by Swedenborg, who learned it, he reasonably declares; from the experience granted him to enable him to discharge his commission. But may I not, especially, appeal to the view of the Last Judgment delivered in the last Section, and to the evidence there adduced of its having been accomplished, as being as plain as it is new? Yet the performance of that great event was announced by Swedenborg, from, as he averred, his own experimental knowledge, while, as yet, nothing had been experienced in the world to support his assertion. But by what clouds of evidence has it been supported since! Here is, it really appears, a proof equivalent to the greatest miracle, of Swedenborg's having been the Human Instrument requisite to announce the Second Coming of the Lord and the execution of the Last Judgment: he did announce them: and we see, by palpable facts that they must have taken place. He neither performed direct miracles, nor delivered predictions: but, by declaring the accomplishment of a great event in the spiritual world, which was inevitably to be soon followed by great effects in the natural world, which effects we have so unquestionably witnessed, he has given his testimony all the authority it could derive either from miracles or prophecy, without making it injuriously compulsive. In our subsequent Sections and in the sequel of this, we shall, I trust, meet other important points that are indubitably true, and capable of the most conclusive proof, but to discover which, in the first instance, must have either required knowledge absolutely supernatural, or a perception of truth in the Scriptures beyond the reach of any unassisted human intellect. They are fully equal in interest and moment to the most magnificent ideas which can be formed of the truth to be communicated at the second coming of the Lord: do they not then as fully accredit him whose writings convey them, as the Herald of the second advent, as the preaching of John the Baptist, owned by the Saviour himself accredited him as the Herald of the first?

SECTION V.

A HUMAN INSTRUMENT NECESSARY, AND THEREFORE RAISED UP.

PART II.

Specific Evidences to the Qualifications of Swedenborg, and to the Truth of his Claims.

In the preceding PART of this SECTION, I have offered a general view of Swedenborg's qualifications for the holy office to which, as we are satisfied, he was called: we will here support what was there advanced by some testimonies of persons of learning and rank as to his character and attainments, and as to certain uncommon powers which were conferred upon him as necessary for the discharge of his commission.

It will perhaps be most proper to begin with the account which Swedenborg gives of himself, as contained in a letter to his friend, the Rev. T. Hartley; and then to see how it is corroborated by what others have testified respecting him. The letter is as follows:*

"I take pleasure in the friendship you express for me in your letter, and return you sincere thanks for the same: but as to the praises which you bestow upon me, I only receive them as tokens of your love of the truths contained in my writings, and so refer them to the Lord our Saviour, from whom is all truth, because he is THE TRUTH. (John xiv. 6.) It is the concluding part of your letter that chiefly engages my attention, where you say as follows: 'As after your departure from England disputes may arise on the subject of your writings, and so give occasion of defending their author against such false reports and aspersions as they who are no friends to truth may invent to the prejudice of his character, may it not be of use, in order to refute any calumnies of that kind, that you leave in my hands some short account of yourself; as concerning, for example, your degrees in the university, the offices you have borne, your

* The original Latin may be seen in a former periodical publication called the Aurora, vol. ii. p. 224, &c., from which I have in some places corrected Mr. Hartley's version of it. The date of it is 1769. The letter was first published by Mr. Hartley in the preface to his translation of the work "On the Intercourse between the Soul and the Body," called by him, "A Treatise on Influx," printed in Swedenborg's life-time.

family and connections, the honors which I am told have been conferred upon you, and such other particulars as may serve to the vindication of your character, if attacked; that so any ill-grounded prejudice may be obviated or removed? For where the honor and interest of truth are concerned, it certainly behoves us to employ all lawful means in its defence and support.' — After reflecting on the foregoing passage, I was induced to comply with your friendly advice, by briefly communicating the following circumstances of my life.

"I was born at Stockholm, in the year 1689,* Jan. 29th. My father's name was Jesper Swedberg: who was bishop of West-Gothland; and a man of celebrity in his time. He was also elected a member of the [English] Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts; for he had been appointed by King Charles XII. as bishop over the Swedish churches in Pennsylvania and London. In the year 1710 I began my travels, first going to England, and thence to Holland, France, and Germany; whence I returned home in 1714. In the year 1716, and afterwards, I had many conversations with Charles XII. King of Sweden, who was pleased to bestow on me a large share of his favor, and in that year appointed me to the office of Assessor of the Metallic College; in which I continued till the year 1747, when I resigned it: but I still retain the salary annexed to it, as an appointment for life. My sole view in this resignation was, that I might be more at liberty to devote myself to that new function to which the Lord had called me. On my resigning my office, a higher degree of rank was offered me: but this I utterly declined, lest it should be the occasion of inspiring me with pride. In 1719, I was ennobled by Queen Ulrica Eleonora, and named *Swedenborg*; from which time I have taken my seat with the Nobles of the Equestrian Order in the Triennial Assemblies of the States of the Realm. I am a Fellow, by invitation, of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Stockholm: but I have never sought admission into any other literary Society, as I belong to an angelic society, wherein things relating to heaven and the soul are the only subjects of discourse and entertainment; whereas the things which occupy the attention of our literary societies are such as relate to the world and the body. In the year 1734, I published at Leipsic the *Regnum Minerale*, in three vols. folio; and in 1738, I took a journey into Italy, and stayed a year at Venice and Rome.

"With respect to my family-connections: I had four sisters. One of them was married to Eric Benzelius, afterwards promoted to the Archbishoprick of Upsal: and thus I became related to the two succeeding Archbishops of that See, both

* It has been ascertained that this should be 1688.

named Benzelius, and younger brothers of the former. My second sister was married to Lars Benzelstierna, who was promoted to a provincial government. But all these are dead: however, two bishops who are related to me are still living: one of them, named Filenius, is bishop of East-Gothland, and now officiates as President of the Ecclesiastical Order in the Diet at Stockholm in the room of the Archbishop, who is infirm; he married my sister's daughter; the other, named Benzelstierna, is bishop of Westermania and Dalecarlia; he is the son of my second sister. Not to mention others of my relations who enjoy stations of dignity. I live, besides, on terms of familiarity and friendship with all the bishops of my country, who are ten in number; as also with the sixteen Senators, and the rest of the Nobility; for they know that I am in fellowship with angels. The King and Queen, also, and the three princes their sons, show me much favor: I was once invited by the King and Queen to dine at their table,—an honor which is in general granted only to the Nobility of the highest rank; and likewise, since, with the Hereditary Prince. They all wish for my return home; so far am I from being in any danger of persecution in my own country, as you seem to apprehend, and so kindly wish to provide against; and should any thing of the kind befall me elsewhere, it cannot hurt me.

“But I regard all that I have mentioned as matters of respectively little moment: for, what far exceeds them, I have been called to a holy office by the Lord himself, who most graciously manifested himself in person to me, his servant, in the year 1743; when he opened my sight to the view of the spiritual world, and granted me the privilege of conversing with spirits and angels which I enjoy to this day. From that time I began to print and publish various *arcana* that have been seen by me or revealed to me; as respecting heaven and hell, the state of man after death, the true worship of God, the spiritual sense of the Word; with many other most important matters conducive to salvation and true wisdom. The only reason of my latter journeys to foreign countries, has been the desire of being useful, by making known the *arcana* entrusted to me.

“As to this world's wealth, I have what is sufficient. and more I neither seek nor wish for.*

“Your letter has drawn the mention of these things from me, with the view, as you suggest, that any ill-grounded prejudices may be removed. Farewell; and from my heart I wish you all felicity both in this world and the next; which I make no doubt of your attaining, if you look and pray to our Lord.

“EMAN. SWEDENBORG.”

* This remark is an answer to an offer by Mr. Hartley to supply him with money, should he have occasion for it.

Now if the writer of this letter really was invested with the character he assumes, could any thing be more suited to that character than the whole of its contents? Does not every sentence and expression in it bespeak the truly humble, pious, and heavenly minded man? Could any one who falsely pretended to what the Author professes, write of himself in a manner so perfectly in accord with the pretensions assumed? Would it be possible for an impostor, whether hypocritical or self-deluded, to assume that air of genuine simplicity, inward composure, and unfeigned contentedness, which reigns throughout the whole?

The information here delivered by the Author, divides itself into two general parts: *first*, the account of his life and general character; *secondly*, his call by the Lord to a holy office, and the consequent opening of the sight of his spirit, and endowment with the privilege of conversing with spirits and angels. We will see how both are supported by the testimony of others.

1. A confirmation of all the statements contained in the *first* part of the above letter, is given by the Rev. Nicholas Collin, of Philadelphia. This gentleman does not profess the sentiments of Swedenborg: but in the year 1801, when, in consequence of the adoption of those sentiments by many in America, the character and life of Swedenborg had there become the subject, as he states, of "frequent and sedulous inquiries," he published the above letter of his illustrious countryman, with a comment of his own, in "the Philadelphia Gazette" of Aug. 5th, 8th, and 10th. It was re-printed in "the New Jerusalem Church Repository," published at Philadelphia in 1817, at which time Mr. C. was still performing the duties of Pastor of the Swedish Church in that city. His testimony therefore is probably that of a still living witness.* Mr. Collin was well qualified to give authentic information, having, when a very young man, lived three years at Stockholm, when "Swedenborg was a great object of public attention in that metropolis, and his extraordinary character was a frequent topic of discussion. Not seldom he appeared in public, and mixed in private societies; therefore sufficient opportunities were given to make observations on him." I extract the sentences containing the heads of Mr. C.'s comment, in confirmation of some of which he goes into several details.

"His family-connections were such as he relates, and well known in Sweden; some of them by myself personally. The mention of his father being, though honorable, modestly short, I shall enlarge upon it. • This Jesper Swedberg was well qualified for one of the principal bishopricks in Sweden, by his piety,

* When the first edition of this work was published.

learning, integrity, benevolence, and all other virtues." "Swedenborg is silent on the merits of his youth, which were great." "The office of Counsellor in the Metallic College was conferred on him by King Charles as a reward for knowledge acquired by the labors of youth, and a means of making it very beneficial to the nation: that Board having inspection over the mines and metallic works, so important in that country; and being a constitutional department of the government." "Swedenborg asserts with truth, that he was in favor with the royal family, and generally respected by the first classes. This was due to his learning and excellence of character." "Swedenborg states properly his rank of nobility. He had the common degree, and was not, as many style him, a Baron; which title denotes the second class of noblemen; the first among the three classes being counts."*

Mr. Collin adds an account of an interview which he once had with Swedenborg: it contains nothing very remarkable, but enough to evince that his behavior on intimacy by no means tended to diminish the respect which his reputation had excited. "In the summer of 1766," says Mr. C., "I waited on him at his house; introducing myself with an apology for the freedom I took. He received me very kindly. We conversed for near three hours; principally on the nature of human souls, and their states in the invisible world; discussing the principal theories of psychology, by various authors; among them the celebrated Dr. Wallerius, late Professor of Natural Theology at Upsal. He asserted positively, as he often does in his works, that he had intercourse with spirits of deceased persons." "We parted," says Mr. C., "with mutual satisfaction."

The next testimony that I shall offer is from a public document of the greatest authority. It is no other than an oration delivered in the Swedish Royal Academy of Sciences, on occasion of Swedenborg's death, by the Chevalier de Sandel, Superintendent of the Mines, and Knight of the Order of the Polar Star, at a meeting of the Academy held in the Great Hall of the House of Nobles, October 7th, 1772. The circumstance of the delivery of such a discourse, is alone a conclusive proof of the high estimation in which the subject of it was held. As Asmus of Wandsbeck, referring to this production, says of the most erudite of his censurers, "They would have suspend-

* This is unquestionably a just account of his rank: but it may be observed, that, though he had not a title, his degree was the same as in England carries the title of Baron, or Lord; for it gave him a seat in the House of Nobles, or of Peers, in the Diet or Parliament of his country. The higher rank, which, he states, in his letter, was offered him on his retirement from office, was, no doubt, that of Baron; which in Sweden is equivalent to our Earl.

ed their opinion concerning him, had they known that Swedenborg possessed all *their* learning in his cradle."* But I must content myself with only extracting a few passages.

"Permit me," says the Orator to the noblemen and gentlemen around him, "to entertain you, this day, upon a subject which is not of an abstract or remote nature, but is intended to revive the agreeable remembrance of a man celebrated for his virtues and his knowledge, one of the oldest members of this Academy, and one whom we all knew and loved.

"The sentiments of esteem and friendship with which we all regarded the late M. Emanuel Swedenborg, assure me of the pleasure with which you will listen to me while he is the subject of my discourse; happy should I be, could I answer your expectations, and draw his eulogium in the manner it deserves! But if there are some countenances, of which, as the painters assure us, it is extremely difficult to give an exact likeness; how difficult then must it be to delineate that of a vast and sublime genius, who never knew either repose or fatigue; who, occupied with the sciences the most profound, was long engaged with researches into the secrets of nature, and who, in his latter years, applied all his efforts to unveil the greatest mysteries; who, to arrive at certain branches of knowledge, opened for himself a way of his own, without ever straying from sound morals and true piety; who, being endowed with a strength of faculties truly extraordinary, in the decline of his age, boldly elevated his thoughts still further, and soared to the greatest heights to which the intellectual faculty can rise; and who, finally, has given occasion to form respecting him a multitude of opinions differing as much from each other as do the minds of the different men by whom they are formed! —

"But we have to follow him in longer and more numerous travels, in diversified occupations and undertakings, and through routes often attended with difficulty. And in order that no reserve or apprehension may afterwards invade us, and make us hesitate at accompanying him any further, as often happens when we have not had time to make ourselves sufficiently acquainted with a traveling companion beforehand; represent to yourselves in Swedenborg the happy union of a strong memory, a quick conception, and a sound judgment; represent to yourselves these excellent qualities united to an ardent desire and encouraging hope of acquiring the most profound attainments in Philosophy, in all the branches of Mathematics, in Natural History, in Mechanics, in Anatomy, and even in Theology: let us not forget his skill in the Oriental and European languages: let us recollect the force of habit, acting in him in

* See the Aurora, vol. ii. p. 220.

concert with the use of reason, especially in respect to the order in which he arranged his thoughts; without a regard to which, when they are too much occupied upon abstruse meditations, they are apt to give themselves up, without distinction of objects, to the fire of a too lively imagination: add to all this an excellent heart, as proved and formed by the rules which he had prescribed for his conduct, and which I have found noted down in several of his manuscripts; which are these; 1. Often to read and meditate on the Word of God: 2. To submit every thing to the will of Divine Providence: 3. To observe in every thing a propriety of behavior, and always to keep the conscience clear: 4. To discharge with fidelity the functions of his employment and the duties of his office, and to render himself in all things useful to society. Such were the characteristic traits of Swedenborg's mind: and whoever thinks there is the least exaggeration in the delineation of them, must, in some shape or other, be the victim of prejudice.

"He finished, in 1733, his great work entitled, *Opera Philosophica et Mineralia*, which was printed in 1734 at Dresden and Leipsic. The Consistory of the University, and the Academy of Sciences, of Upsal, did themselves the honor of being the first to acknowledge the merit of their illustrious countryman, and to show him marks of their esteem. The Consistory, in 1724, had invited him to accept the situation of Professor of the Pure Mathematics, vacant by the death of Nils Celsius; and this, because, as they expressed themselves, his acceptance of the office would be to the advantage of the students and the ornament of the University. But he declined the honor. The Academy of Sciences admitted him into the number of its members in 1729.

"But the learned abroad now hastened to give him marks of their consideration. The Academy of Sciences of St. Petersburg appointed him a Corresponding Member, by a diploma dated Dec. 17th, 1734. Christian Wolff, and other foreign literati, were eager to establish with him a literary correspondence, and consulted him on many intricate subjects. The Editors of the *Acto Eruditorum* of Leipsic, which gives an account of the works of men of science and literature, found in those of Swedenborg a rich harvest with which to ornament their collection. Nor has time yet deprived his *Opera Philosophica et Mineralia* of any of their value. The authors of the magnificent *Description des Arts et Metiers*, now publishing at Paris have thought so highly of the second part, which treats of Iron and Steel, that they have translated it, and inserted it entire in their collection."

His character as a theologian, was, of course, not a subject

for examination in this Eulogium, and yet it could not be passed without notice. M. de Sandal adverts to it, as a natural philosopher might be expected to do when addressing natural philosophers, but without at all treating it as a matter of ridicule.

"I have as yet," he says, "only spoken of one part of the works of Swedenborg; he afterwards entered on another route."

Having given a list of his theological works, he says, "The titles of these works announce matters of great importance: and though the subjects of them are different, they are all founded on Anatomy, on Physics, on Philosophy, on explications of Holy Scripture, on certain revelations and visions; and they all conduct us, according to his manner of treating them to serious meditations respecting the Supreme Being, the soul, things invisible and spiritual, and the life hereafter. We thus now find, soaring above the clouds, the same man whom we have just been following in the mines, in furnaces and workshops; and we find him every where equally diligent, zealous, and fertile in emblematical illustrations. —"

"I have probably dwelt too long on Swedenborg's theological works; these are not matters to be discussed in an Academy of Sciences. Suffice it then to say, that his merit and excellent qualities shine with brilliancy, even where we are endeavoring to discover in him the weaknesses inseparable from human nature. I do not come here to defend errors or unintelligible principles: but I will venture to assert, — and I reckon, gentlemen, on meeting your approbation in the assertion, — that where others would have discovered a deficiency of intelligence and a confusion of ideas, Swedenborg has displayed an astonishing assemblage of knowledge; which he has arranged, according to his system, in such order, that the elements themselves would have striven in vain to turn him out of his course."

I only add two or three other notices from this Eulogium.

"Never did he allow himself to have recourse to dissimulation. He was the sincere friend of mankind. — In society he was cheerful and agreeable. By way of relaxation from his important labors, he sought and frequented the company of persons of information, by whom he was always well received. As a public functionary, he was upright and just: while he discharged his duties with great exactness, he neglected nothing but his own advancement. Having been called, without solicitation on his part, to a distinguished post, he never sought any further promotion. When his private occupations began to encroach upon the time required for the functions of his office, he resigned it, and remained content with the title which he had borne while exercising it for one-and-thirty years. As a mem-

ber of the Equestrian Order of the House of Nobles he took his seat in several of the Diets of the Realm; in which his conduct was such as to secure him both from the reproaches of his own conscience and from those of others. He enjoyed excellent health, having scarcely ever experienced the slightest indisposition. Content within himself, and with his situation, his life was, in all respects, one of the happiest that ever fell to the lot of man, till the very moment of its close."

The above is translated from the version from the original Swedish prefixed to a French translation of Swedenborg's *True Christian Religion*, published at Paris in 1802. More unexceptionable testimony to his high character as a man of learning and virtue, cannot certainly be desired.

The next that I shall offer is that of a man whose exalted rank and great attainments give the utmost weight to his testimony and opinions. This is Count Andrew John Von Hôpken. He was one of the institutors of the Swedish Royal Academy of Sciences, which, being a man of eminent learning, he served for a considerable period in the quality of Secretary. He afterwards was, for many years, prime minister of the kingdom; which station, in addition to his post as one of the sixteen Senators, with whom, prior to the revolution in 1772, the royal power in fact was vested, the king being merely the president of that body, made him the second person in the kingdom. He died on the 9th of March, 1790. In "the New Jerusalem Magazine," published in 1790 and 1791, are five letters of this nobleman's to General Tuxen, in answer to some inquiries respecting Swedenborg made by the latter. Count Hôpken's letters exhibit much of the wariness of an old politician; yet while he even seems to censure some parts of Swedenborg's writings, his anxiety to apologize for them clearly discovers what was his real opinion. The dates of the letters are May 11th, 1772, May 21, 1773, August 1, 1773, January 13, 1774, and July 6, 1781. I give some sentences, chiefly from the first and longest; the whole of which I only abstain from quoting from a regard to brevity. — "All I could say," states the Count, "by way of preliminary on this subject, regards the person of the late Assessor Swedenborg. I have not only known him these two-and-forty years, but also, some time since, daily frequented his company. A man who, like me, has lived long in the world, and even in an extensive career of life, must have had numerous opportunities of knowing men as to their virtues and vices, but I do not recollect ever to have known a man of more uniformly virtuous character than Swedenborg. He was always contented, and never fretful and morose, although throughout his life his soul was occupied with

sublime thoughts and speculations. He was a true philosopher, and lived like one. He was gifted with a most happy genius, and a fitness for every science ; which made him shine in all that he pursued. In his youth he was a great poet : I have in my possession some fragments of his Latin poetry, which Ovid would not have been ashamed to own. The style of his Latin prose, in his middle age, was easy, elegant, and ornamental : in his latter years it was equally clear, but less elegant after he turned his thoughts to spiritual subjects. He was well acquainted with the Hebrew and Greek ; an able and profound mathematician ; and a skillful engineer." "He detested metaphysics [as usually taught] as founded on fallacious ideas, because they transcend our sphere ; by means of which Theology has been drawn from its simplicity and corrupted. He was perfectly conversant with mineralogy." "In Holland he began to apply himself to anatomy , in which he made some remarkable discoveries, which are preserved somewhere in the *Acta Literaria*." "He possessed a sound judgment on all occasions ; he saw every thing clearly, and expressed himself well on every subject. The most solid memorials, and the best penned, at the Diet of 1761, on matters of finance, were presented by him. In one of these, he refuted a large work in quarto on the same subject, quoting all the corresponding passages in it ; and all this in less than one sheet." "He might, with or without reason, (which I do not venture to determine), be accused of having given a warm imagination too free play in his revelations ; but, for my part, I have nothing on which I could found this conclusion. Whether or no our Lord, in our times, may grant to particular persons particular revelations ; what is the nature of such revelations ; and by what criterion we are to distinguish the genuine from the false : of all this I have no solid grounds for judging. But if, according to human notions, we were to compare the revelations in the Apocalypse with those of Swedenborg, I know not to which of the two the preference would be given. — I once represented to this venerable man, in rather a serious manner, that he would do better not to mix his beautiful writings with so many revelations, which ignorance makes a jest of, and turns into ridicule. But he answered, 'that this did not depend on himself : that he was too old to trifle with spiritual things, and too much concerned for his eternal happiness to give in to such notions, were they unfounded :' and he assured me, on his hopes of salvation, 'that no imagination produced in him his revelations, which were true and from what he had heard and seen.' It may be so : the church cannot judge of mysteries ; nor can I. — When the generality are speaking of the theology of Swedenborg, they always dwell on his

revelations, and think that every thing consists in these. In regard to what he relates of the spiritual world, and the other progressions in the angelic heaven, there appears I think, an analogy with, and resemblance of, the gradations which God has established in this world, and in which no variations or exceptions are admitted; insomuch that Swedenborg has taken the same road by which we proceed from the visible to the invisible; from things known to things unknown: from several collected facts to one fundamental truth before unknown to us; in like manner as, in arithmetic, we are led from known numbers to those we seek. We have no other way of obtaining knowledge. Few persons have judiciously read his works, which every where sparkle with genius. If I meet with any thing unusual, extravagant, or which might be thought to indicate a disordered understanding, I do not judge of it. We read Plato with admiration: but there is nothing to be met with in his works, which, if related by another person, might not be deemed extravagant, inconceivable, and absurd."—The late Swedenborg certainly was a pattern of sincerity, of virtue, and of piety; and at the same time, in my opinion, the most learned man in this kingdom."—"The Swedenborgian system is more comprehensible to our reason, and less complicated, than other systems; and while it forms virtuous men and good citizens, it prevents all kinds of enthusiasm and superstition, both of which occasion so many and such cruel vexations, or ridiculous singularities, in the world. From the present state of religion, as more or less every where conspicuous according to the more or less free form of government, I am perfectly convinced, that the interpolation which men have confusedly inserted into it have nearly effected its total corruption or revolution: and when this is seen, the Swedenborgian system will become more general, more acceptable, and better understood, than at present. '*Opinionum commenta delet dies, naturæ judicia confirmat,*' says Cicero."

The above testimony must surely be allowed to carry the greatest weight, both as it refers to the character of Swedenborg himself and of his writings. On the former subject, the assertions of a person of such rank and knowledge of the world, and founded on a forty-two year's intimacy, are beyond all exception; and on the latter, the opinion of a man of such intelligence, and such evident prudence and caution, is entitled to the highest respect.

Connected with the last testimony is that of General Christian Tuxen, to whom Count Hópken's letters were addressed. This gentleman, being the king of Denmark's Commissioner of war at Elsineur, at which port the vessels in which Swedenborg

was proceeding on his voyages frequently stopped in their passage through the Sound, repeatedly obtained the company of the illustrious stranger at his house. In a letter to Mr. Nordenskjöld,* he details many particulars of these interviews: and the result was, that he was so completely satisfied with his "valuable guest," that he calls him, at the close of his letter, "our late benefactor, and in truth not only ours, but that of all mankind, if they are seriously solicitous about their state after death. For my part," he adds, "I thank our Lord the God of heaven, that I have been acquainted with this great man and his writings. I esteem this as the greatest blessing I ever experienced in this life, and hope I shall profit by them in working out my salvation."

Dr. Gabriel Andrew Beyer, Professor of Greek Literature and Assessor in the Consistory of Gottenburg, became one of Swedenborg's most intimate friends, and one of the most active promoters of his sentiments. This drew upon him a severe persecution from the Consistory. The matter was carried before the supreme Government, when, in compliance with an order from the king, Dr. Beyer presented to his majesty, Jan. 2nd, 1770, a Declaration of his sentiments in regard to the doctrines of Swedenborg.† Towards the close, the amiable and learned author expresses himself thus: "In obedience to your Majesty's most gracious command, that I should deliver a full and positive declaration respecting the writings of Swedenborg, I do acknowledge it to be my duty to declare, in all humble confidence, that so far as I have proceeded in the study of them, and according to such gifts for investigation and judgment as I possess, I have found in them nothing but what closely coincides with the words of the Lord himself; and that they shine with a light truly divine."

Mr. Robsam, Director of the Bank of Stockholm, was another intimate friend of Swedenborg's; and he has testified his opinion of him by publishing several anecdotes, tending to recommend him to acceptance as an extraordinarily gifted man. We shall have occasion to advert to Mr. R. again.

Mr. Springer, a Swedish gentleman who had filled several important offices, and was during many years, the Swedish Consul at the port of London, was the intimate friend of Swedenborg, both in Sweden and in England. He was known to

* Dated from Elsinour, May 4th, 1790, and printed in "the New Jerusalem Magazine."

† It may be seen in "the Intellectual Repository," Vol. i. (First Series). p. 113, &c.: it has also been since published in the form of a small tract: for it contains a most masterly vindication of the sentiments selected by the Consistory for condemnation.

many of the early readers of Swedenborg's works in this country, and has left the strongest testimony to the worth and extraordinary character of his friend. But to him, also, we shall have occasion to advert again.

But beside his own countrymen and other foreigners, some who know him in this country have added their most decided suffrage to his excellent qualities.

Of these the principal is the Rev. Thomas Hartley, M. A., Rector of Winwick in Northamptonshire; who, having met with some of Swedenborg's works, sought an acquaintance with their author, and was admitted by him to his intimate friendship. Mr. Hartley has left his testimony respecting him on record in the prefaces to the English editions of the works "On the Intercourse between the Soul and the Body," and "On Heaven and Hell," and in a letter to the translator of "the True Christian Religion," inserted in the preface to that work. In the first of these prefaces, Mr. H. says, respecting his author, "I have conversed with him at different times, and in company with a gentleman of a learned profession and of extensive intellectual abilities: we have had confirmation of these things from his own mouth, and have received his testimony, and do both of us consider this our acquaintance with the author and his writings among the greatest blessings of our lives."—"The extensive learning displayed in his writings evinces him to be the scholar and the philosopher: and his polite behavior and address bespeak him the gentleman. He affects no honor, but declines it; pursues no worldly interest, but spends his substance in travelling and printing, in order to communicate instruction and benefit to mankind: and he is so far from the ambition of heading a sect, that wherever he resides on his travels he is a mere solitary, and almost inaccessible, though in his own country of a free and open behavior. He has nothing of the precisian in his manner, nothing of melancholy in his temper, and nothing in the least bordering on the enthusiast in his conversation and writings." Mr. H. makes similar remarks in his Letter to the translator of the True Christian Religion: "The great Swedenborg was a man of uncommon humility." "He was of a catholic spirit, and loved all good men of every church, making at the same time all candid allowance for the innocence of involuntary error."—"However self-denying in his own person, as to gratifications and indulgences, even within the bounds of moderation: yet nothing severe, nothing of the precisian, appeared in him, but, on the contrary, an inward serenity and complacency of mind were manifest in the sweetness of his looks and outward demeanor."—"It may reasonably be supposed, that I have weighed the character of our

lustrious author in the scale of my best judgment, from the personal knowledge I had of him, from the best information I could procure respecting him, and from a diligent perusal of his writings: and according thereto, I have found him to be the sound divine, the good man, the deep philosopher, the universal scholar, and the polite gentleman: and I further believe, that he had a high degree of illumination from the Spirit of God; was commissioned by him as an extraordinary messenger to the world; and had communication with angels and the spiritual worlds far beyond any since the time of the apostles. As such I offer his character to the world, solemnly declaring that, to the best of my knowledge, I am not herein led by any partiality or private views whatever, being much dead to every worldly interest, and accounting myself as unworthy of any higher character than that of a penitent sinner."—What Mr. Hartley here says of himself is unquestionably true; for he was well known to many of the religious characters of that day as a man of the deepest piety, and he was, at this time (in 1781) very far advanced in years, and near the end of his earthly career: to the testimony of such a man to the character of Swedenborg, what exception can be made?

The "gentleman of a learned profession and of extensive intellectual abilities," mentioned by Mr. Hartley above, was the late Dr. Messiter, an eminent physician of that time. What his opinion of Swedenborg, the result of personal acquaintance, was, appears from his correspondence with the Professors of Divinity at Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Aberdeen;* to which Universities, by the desire of Swedenborg, he, in 1769, presented some of his works. In his letter to Dr. Hamilton at Edinburgh, Dr. M. says, "As I have had the honor of being frequently admitted to the author's company when he was in London, and to converse with him on various points of learning, I will venture to affirm, that there are no parts of mathematical, philosophical, or medical knowledge, nay, I believe I might justly say, of human literature, to which he is in the least a stranger; yet so totally insensible is he of his own merit, that I am confident he does not know that he has any; and as himself somewhere says of the angels, he always turns his head away on the slightest encomium." (Dr. Hamilton, in his answer, candidly says, "I have seen enough to convince me that the Honorable Author is a very learned and pious man: qualities that shall ever command my respect.") So in his letter to Dr. Gerard at Aberdeen, Dr. Messiter, speaking of Swedenborg's works, says, "They are the productions of a man whose good qualities, resulting from his natural and acquired abilities, I can

* See Intellectual Repository, Vol. iii. (first series) p. 449, &c.

with much truth, from my frequent converse with him, assert, are a high ornament to human nature. Credulity, prejudice, or partiality, seem to have no share in his composition or character; nor is he in the least influenced by any avaricious or interested views. A proof of this last assertion was afforded me, by his refusing an offer of any money he might have occasion for while in England; which was made him on a supposal, that his want of connections in a place where he was a stranger might prove an obstacle to his divine pursuits."

With the Englishmen whose approbation of Swedenborg's sentiments was strengthened by a personal acquaintance with himself, must be reckoned the late Mr. Wm. Cookworthy; a man of most superior character, the friend of the first Lord Camelford, and of Captain Jervis, afterwards Earl St. Vincent, and the associate of many of the literati of his day. This gentleman testified his satisfaction with Swedenborg and his writings, by joining with Mr. Hartley in translating the treatise on Heaven and Hell, and defraying the whole expense of the printing and publication.*

To the above may be added the testimony of Mr. and Mrs. Shearsmith, in whose house Swedenborg died. To rebut a malicious report pretended to be founded on their authority, that Swedenborg, in his last hours had recanted his statements, they made an affidavit, dated Nov. 2nd, 1785, deposing to the circumstances of his last illness and death; in which they aver, "that he enjoyed a sound mind, memory, and understanding, to the last hour of his life." Many are now living, of whom I am one, who can bear witness to the strong terms of respect in which they always spoke of their noble lodger.†

In the testimony to Swedenborg's virtues and attainments, thus borne by so many most unexceptionable witnesses who knew him well, and against which no opposing testimony whatever, from persons acquainted with him, can be adduced, we surely have the most satisfactory confirmation, not only of his own account of his life and character, but of all that is advanced above, as to his qualifications for the office to which he declares he was appointed, and as to the antecedent probability, that he might be the Human Instrument selected to communicate the truths connected with the second advent of the Lord, on the supposition that the time for that event has arrived. We also see that many men of the very first respectability, intelligence, and learning, who formed their opinion from a knowl-

* See a Memoir of him in "the Intellectual Repository," New Series, Vol. i. p. 489, &c.

† See the affidavit at length in the "New Magazine of Knowledge," for 1791.

edge of the man as well as of his writings, believed, during his life time, that he actually was such an Instrument.

II. But, *secondly*, it may perhaps be thought, that if, in consequence of having been called by the Lord to a holy office, he really had the privilege of conversing with angels and spirits, some plain proofs of it, beyond his own assertions might occasionally occur. Now that such proofs did occur, is a certain fact. He indeed never appeals to them in support of his mission : he shows, in various parts of his writings, that where the mind is not receptive of truth by its own evidence, no external testimony will force it in : he therefore affirms, what we shall presently advert to, that it would have been incompatible with the nature of the truly spiritual dispensation to be opened by the second coming of the Lord to prove it by miracles. To the performance of miracles, therefore, he made no claim, yet as Providence permitted him, on some occasions, to give full demonstration of his supernatural knowledge, we must conclude that it was granted for some useful end. That end may be, to afford satisfaction to those, who, though favorably inclined towards the doctrines of the New Church in general, would yet feel more assured by some external tokens. On those who are decidedly opposed to the truths contained in our author's writings, no external tokens whatever, we are quite certain, would induce reception : but to others, those which follow may be useful as confirmations : in which light, only, they are offered.

Two of the most extraordinary instances of Swedenborg's access to the spiritual world, are those respecting the Countess de Marteville, whose husband was ambassador at the Swedish court from Holland, and the Queen of Sweden, Louisa Ulrica, wife of King Adolphus Frederic, and sister of the celebrated Frederic of Prussia. Many editions of these anecdotes in different works, resting on the authority of different relaters, have appeared ; but all agreeing in substance. Both of them are given by M. Perneti, in the preface to his French translation of the treatise on Heaven and Hell, upon the authority of Count Hôpken. Both are mentioned, also, by Mr. Springer ; and that relating to the Queen is given in the letter of General Tuxen's cited above ; who states, that, having heard of it from various persons, he enquired the exact particulars from Swedenborg himself. But we will give it in the Queen's own words ; as recorded, together with the anecdote of the Countess de Marteville, by an author who cannot be suspected of any partiality in favor of Swedenborg ; I mean M. Dieudonne Thiebault, a French *savant* of the school of Voltaire, and Professor of Belles Letters in the Royal Academy of Berlin. He was the author of a work translated into English, and printed at London, in

1805, under the title of "Original Anecdotes of Frederic the Great, King of Prussia." He represents Queen Louisa Ulrica as being, like her brother, a professed *esprit fort*, carrying it even to the avowal of atheism; which I mention as necessary to account for the contradictory remarks with which she concludes her narration; and because it makes her a more unexceptionable witness to the fact she relates. It occurred in 1759.

M. Thiebault says, "I know not on what occasion it was, that, conversing one day with the Queen on the subject of the celebrated visionary, Swedenborg, we (the members of the academy) expressed a desire, particularly M. Merian and myself, to know what opinion was entertained of him in Sweden. I on my part related what had been told me respecting him by Chamberlain D'Hamon, who was still alive, and who had been Ambassador from Prussia both to Holland and France. It was, 'that his brother-in-law (the Count de Marteville), Ambassador from Holland to Stockholm, having died suddenly, a shopkeeper demanded of his widow the payment of a bill for some articles of drapery, which she remembered had been paid in her husband's life-time: that the widow not being able to find the shopkeeper's receipt, had been advised to consult with Swedenborg, who, she was told, could converse with the dead whenever he pleased; that she accordingly adopted this advice, though she did so less from credulity than curiosity; and at the end of a few days Swedenborg informed her, that her deceased husband had taken the shopkeeper's receipt for the money on such a day, at such an hour, as he was reading such an article in Bayle's Dictionary in his cabinet; and that his attention being called immediately afterwards to some other concern, he put the receipt into the book to mark the place at which he left off; where in fact it was found, at the page described.' The Queen replied, that though she was but little disposed to believe in such seeming miracles, she nevertheless had been willing to put the power of M. Swedenborg, with whom she was acquainted, to the proof: that she was previously acquainted with the anecdote I had related, and it was one of those that mostly had excited her astonishment, though she had never taken the pains to ascertain the truth of it; but that M. Swedenborg having come one evening to her court, she had taken him aside, and begged him to inform himself of her deceased brother, the Prince Royal of Prussia, what he said to her at the moment of her taking leave of him for the court of Stockholm. She added, that what she had said was of a nature to render it impossible that the Prince could have repeated it to any one, nor had it ever escaped her own lips; that, some days after, Swedenborg returned, when she was seated at cards, and re-

requested she would grant him a private audience ; to which she replied, he might communicate what he had to say before the company ; but that Swedenborg assured her he could not disclose his errand in the presence of witnesses : that in consequence of this intimation the Queen became agitated, gave her cards to another lady, and requested M. de Schwerin (who also was present when she related the story to us) to accompany her : that they accordingly went together into another apartment, where she posted M. de Schwerin at the door, and advanced towards the farthest extremity of it with Swedenborg ; who said to her, — ‘ You took, madam, your last leave of the Prince of Prussia, your late august brother, at Charlottenburg, on such a day, and at such an hour of the afternoon ; as you were passing afterwards through the long gallery, in the castle of Charlottenburg, you met him again ; he then took you by the hand, and led you to such a window, where you could not be overheard, and then said to you these words : —————.’ ”

The Queen did not repeat the words, but she protested to us they were the very same her brother had pronounced, and that she retained the most perfect recollection of them. She added, that she nearly fainted at the shock she experienced : and she called on M. de Schwerin to answer for the truth of what she had said ; who, in his laconic style, contented himself with saying, ‘ All you have said, madam, is perfectly true — at least as far as I am concerned.’ “ I ought to add,” M. Thiebault continues, “ that though the Queen laid great stress on the truth of her recital, she professed herself at the same time incredulous to Swedenborg’s supposed conferences with the dead. ‘ A thousand events,’ said she, ‘ appear inexplicable and supernatural to us, who know only the immediate consequences of them ; and men of quick parts, who are never so well pleased as when they exhibit something wonderful, take an advantage of this to gain an extraordinary reputation. M. Swedenborg was a man of learning, and of some talent in this way ; but I cannot imagine by what means he obtained the knowledge of what had been communicated to no one. However, I have no faith in his having had a conference with my brother.’ ”

These *philosophical* remarks of the Queen’s would deserve introduction in a work which I have often thought might be written, and be equally amusing and instructive, under the title of “ The Credulity of Unbelievers.” Here is an accomplished princess, who finds another person in possession of a secret which she is quite sure was only known to herself and her deceased brother : she knows that he did not obtain it from herself, yet rather than believe that he obtained it from her brother, she imagines the existence of “ a talent” incomparably more inexplicable !

The same observation applies to several other relaters of the story. One of these is Baron de Grimm. He allows Swedenborg to have been "a man distinguished not only by his probity, but also by his knowledge and his intelligence." [*un homme distingué non seulement par sa probité, mais encore par ses connaissances et ses lumières*]. Yet he, after giving the above anecdote, gives this contradiction-in-terms as his judgment on it: "This fact is confirmed by authorities so respectable, that IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO DENY IT; but the question is, how to believe it!" [*Ce fait est confirmé par des autorités si respectables qu'il est impossible de le nier; mais le moyen d'y croire!*]* But Baron de Grimm was professedly a determined atheist, and therefore could not believe any fact, however evidenced, which supposes, as real, the existence of man after death.

Another relater of the anecdote is not much less inconsistent. This is Captain Charles Leonard de Stahlhammer, Knight of the Royal Order of the Sword. Some editions of the story affirm, that what Swedenborg repeated to the Queen were the contents of a letter which she had received from her brother: and as the main facts were undeniable, some of Swedenborg's enemies, so late as 1788, endeavored to account for them by the improbable tale, that Count Hôpken had intercepted and opened the letter before the Queen received it, and that he and another Senator communicated the contents of it to Swedenborg, paying him for that purpose a mysterious visit in the night. To this, Captain Stahlhammer replied, in a letter dated May 13th, 1788, and printed in some of the Gazettes. He declares that his account "can be attested by many persons of distinction, who were present, and are still alive." On Swedenborg's delivering his communication, he says, "The Queen, struck with astonishment, was taken ill, and did not recover herself for some time. After she was come to herself, she said to those about her, 'There is only God and my brother who can know what he has just told me.' She owned that he had spoken of her last correspondence with the prince, the subject of which was known to themselves alone. Captain S. then gives the highest character of Count Hôpken; who, he says, "was a declared enemy to secret intrigue and underhand devices." Of Swedenborg, he says, "I cannot explain how he came to the knowledge of this secret. The only weakness of this truly honest man was his belief in the apparition of spirits:

* See *Mémoires Hist. Lit. et Anecdotes*, tirés de la Correspondance adressée au Duc de Saxe Gotha par le Baron de Grimm. Tom. iii. p. 56. Ed. Lond. 1813.

but I knew him a very long time, and I can declare, that he was as fully persuaded that he conversed with spirits as I am that I am writing at this moment. As a citizen and as a friend he was a man of the greatest integrity, abhorring all imposture, and leading an exemplary life." Here then is a man affirming the reality of a supernatural fact, most strongly maintaining Swedenborg's abhorrence of imposture, and insisting that he fully believed that he conversed with spirits, and thus that he received the information in question from the deceased prince himself; yet treating, in the same breath, such belief as a weakness, and making the fact resulting from it altogether inexplicable!*

The next anecdote that I shall adduce is similar in its nature to the last; but, the subject of it being a private person, it has not been so much known. It is to be regretted, also, that the relater of it has withheld his informer's name: he however answers himself for its truth, and is a man who, for his learning and respectable rank, is fully entitled to be believed. The relater is Dr. Stilling, Counsellor at the Court of the Duke of Baden, in a work entitled "*Die Theory der Geister Kunde*," printed at Nuremberg in 1808.† The following is an abridgment of his narrative:

"About the year 1770, there was a merchant in Elberfeld, with whom I lived seven years in the most intimate friendship. He was much attached to mystical writings; but was a man of good sense, and one who would not tell a willful untruth for all

* The whole of Captain Stahlhammer's letter may be seen in a French work entitled "*Abrege des Ouvrages d'Emanuel Swedenborg*," and in "The Intellectual Repository," (first series) vol. i. p. 370, &c., in the review of "The Beauties of Emanuel Swedenborg," &c.; which is a translation from the aforesaid "*Abrege*."

I will take this opportunity to observe, respecting this work, which has been sedulously thrust before the eye of the public, that it ought rather to be called *The Deformities* not indeed of Swedenborg, but of the *Abridger and Translator*. The Translator, being entirely ignorant of his subject, very often misrepresents the Abridger, and the Abridger is very far from justly exhibiting his Original. Indeed, the whole plan of the work is adapted to give a completely false idea of the works of Swedenborg. Each chapter is followed by what the Editor calls a *vision*, which is frequently much longer than the chapter to which it is annexed; thus the reader is led to conclude, that half of Swedenborg's writings is made up of *visions*; which is a more than ten-fold exaggeration. These *visions* too are much longer than any thing of the kind in Swedenborg; for, to compose them, several of his "Memorable Relations" are frequently tacked together, making as confused a jumble as can be conceived.

† From a late English translation of which, under the title of a "Theology of Pneumatology," an extract is given above, pp. 176—179.

the world. He traveled on business to Amsterdam, where, at that time, Swedenborg was. Having heard and read a great deal of this extraordinary man, he went to see him. He found a very venerable and friendly looking old gentleman, who received him politely : when the following dialogue took place." After some preparatory remarks, the *Merchant* said, " ' I think you will not be displeased with a sincere friend of the truth, if he desires an irrefutable proof, that you really have communication with the spiritual world.' " *Swedenborg*. " It would indeed be very wrong, if I were displeased : but I believe I have given already proofs enough, which cannot be refuted.' *M*. ' Do you mean those respecting the Queen, the fire at Stockholm, and the mislaid receipt ?' *S*. ' Yes, I do ; and they are true.' *M*. ' May I be so free as to ask for a proof of the same kind ?' *S*. ' Why not ? with all my heart.' *M*. ' I had a friend, a student of Divinity, at Duysburg : a little before his decease we had an important conversation together : now could you learn from him what was the subject of it ?' *S*. ' We will see : Come to me again in a day or two : I will see if I can find your friend.' The merchant returned accordingly ; when Swedenborg met him with a smile, and said, ' I have spoken with your friend : the subject of your discourse was, the final restoration of all things.' Swedenborg then repeated to the merchant, word for word, what he and his deceased friend had maintained. My friend, says Dr. Stilling, " turned pale ; for this proof was irresistible. — Perfectly convinced, my friend left the extraordinary man, and traveled back again to Elberfeld."

The anecdote here alluded to respecting the fire at Stockholm, has had many relaters : I give the brief account furnished by Mr. Springer, mentioned above, in a letter to M. Perneti, prefixed to the translation by the latter of the *Treatise on Heaven and Hell*. " I asked him," says Mr. S. " whether it was true, as I had heard related, that when he was at Gottenburg [on landing from England], a city sixty Swedish miles from Stockholm, he had told his friends, three days before the arrival of the post, the exact time of the great fire which happened at Stockholm [and consumed all the southern suburbs, in 1759] : to which he replied, that what I had heard was perfectly true." M. Perneti states, from other information, that Swedenborg was afterwards told, that his own house had been the prey of the flames : to which he replied, " No : my house is not burnt : the fire only reached to such and such places." This was found to be the case.

Mr. Springer also relates, from his own knowledge, the following remarkable instance of the same kind. " Fifteen years ago [dating from 1782] Swedenborg was leaving London for

Sweden, and begged of me [as Swedish Consul] to engage his passage with a good captain. I agreed with one named Dixon. When the captain came to fetch him on board, I took leave of him and wished him a good voyage: then turning to the captain, I asked if he had laid in a stock of good provisions; to which he answered, that he had, as much as was necessary. On this Swedenborg interposed, and said, 'My friend, we shall not have occasion for much; for, by the help of God, on this day week, at two o'clock, we shall enter the harbor of Stockholm.' Which assertion, Captain Dixon informed me on his return, was exactly fulfilled."

Another instance of similar knowledge is related by Mr. Robsam, and repeated in Perneti's preface. "I met him," says Mr. R., "in his carriage, as he was setting off on his journey to London the last time but one. I asked him how he could venture on such a voyage at the age of eighty years: 'Do you think,' I added, 'I shall see you any more?' 'Do not make yourself uneasy, my friend,' he replied: 'if you live, we shall see one another again: for I have another of these journeys to make after the present.' He returned accordingly. The last time of his leaving Sweden he came to see me the day he was setting off. I again asked him if we should see one another any more. He answered, with a tender and affecting air, 'I do not know whether I shall return: but I am assured that I shall not die till I have finished the printing of my work entitled *The True Christian Religion*, which is the object of my journey. But if we do not see each other any more in this lower world, we shall meet in the presence of the Lord, if we have kept his commandments.' " He did, accordingly, finish the printing of his last work, here mentioned, at Amsterdam: and he died at London not very long afterwards.

In the affidavit of the Shearsmiths, also, it is declared, that he told them on what day he should die a month before it happened: and we shall see in the sequel, that he made the same communication to another person.

Respecting the certainty of Swedenborg's communication with the spiritual world, Mr. Springer, in his letter to Perneti, makes the following statement. "All that he has related to me respecting my deceased acquaintances, both friends and enemies, and the secrets that were between us, almost surpasses belief. He explained to me in what manner the peace was concluded between Sweden and the King of Prussia; and he praised my conduct on that occasion: he even told me who were the three great personages of whom I made use in that affair; which, nevertheless, was an entire secret between them and me. I asked him how he could be informed of such par-

ticulars, and who had discovered them to him. He answered, 'Who informed me of your affair with Count Ekelblad? You cannot deny the truth of what I have told you. Continue,' he added, 'to deserve his reproaches: turn not aside, either for riches or honors, from the path of rectitude, but, on the contrary, keep steadily in it, as you have done: and you will prosper.' "

To the above anecdotes, I will add the following, which has not before been published, and which I take from a memorandum of the late Mr. Provo, a medical gentleman of the most respectable character, as many now living, besides myself, can testify.* Swedenborg's *Arcana Cœlestia* was printed, between the years 1748 and 1756, at the office of Mr. Hart, in Poppin's Court, Fleet Street; to whom, from the acquaintance thus commenced, Swedenborg became considerably attached, insomuch that, when in London, he often went to spend the evening at his house. Mr. Hart, the son of the former, told Mr. Provo, about the year 1779, that he looked upon Swedenborg as an extraordinary man, for the following reason. Mr. Hart, the father, died in London, while Swedenborg was abroad; who on his return, went to Mr. Hart's house. After being let in at the street-door, he was told that his old friend was dead: to which he instantly replied, "I know that very well; for I saw him in the spiritual world while I was in Holland, at such a time [near the time of his death or soon after]; also, whilst coming over in the packet to England. He is not now in heaven," he continued, "but is coming around, and in a good way to do well." This much surprised the widow and son; for they knew that he was just come over; and, as they assured Mr. Provo, that "he was of such a nature, that he could impose on no one; that he always spoke the truth in every little matter, and would not have made any evasion though his life had been at stake." — The inference from this anecdote may indeed be evaded by pretending, that Swedenborg took advantage of the information he received on entering the house, and turned it to his purpose: but what a ready as well as abandoned liar does this suppose him! None but the most ignorant, as well as most malignant, of his enemies can resort to such a supposition: others must conclude, as did Mrs. Hart and her son, who had the best means of forming the right conclusion, that he was indeed "a remarkable man." — The extent to which he carried his principle of *speaking the truth in every little matter*, may be judged of from the following fact. In 1769 he went to Paris with the intention of printing there his "True Christian

* All the anecdotes collected by Mr. Provo have since been printed in the *Intellectual Repository* for Jan. 1836, p. 27.

Religion." The Censor of the Press, M. Chevreuil, informed him, on application, that a tacit permission would be granted, but that the title must say, *Printed at London or at Amsterdam*. But he refused to concur in this *evasion*; and the work was, *bona fide*, printed at Amsterdam. This anecdote was received from M. Chevreuil himself.*

I could add to the above instances of Swedenborg's supernatural knowledge one which concerned the celebrated Mr. Wesley, and which convinced him, for a time, of the reality of Swedenborg's claims to be regarded as a divinely illuminated herald: but this I reserve to illustrate the next PART of this SECTION.

It may here be mentioned as a curious fact, though not as an addition of actual evidence, that among Swedenborg's contemporaries who were convinced of the reality of his spiritual intercourse and extraordinary illumination, was the celebrated Lavater. In "the New Jerusalem Magazine," so often quoted, are two letters from Lavater to Swedenborg, the genuineness of which has been recently ascertained. In the first, dated Aug. 24, 1768, which begins, "Most reverend and excellent man," Lavater says, "Knowing that so great a man was my contemporary, I could not help inquiring of him a few things which seemed to me to be of the greatest importance; as I knew no person in the world but yourself, who have given proofs of an extraordinary and almost divine knowledge, capable of resolving my questions." Some of his questions, however, are such as Swedenborg neither could nor would resolve; as, for instance, whether Lavater's deceased friend, Felix Hess, would ever appear to him, and make him certain communications;—whether Henry Hess would become a convert to his doctrine of the power of faith and prayer;—which of the inhabitants of Zurich would be convinced of the said doctrine; &c. Under date of Sept. 24, 1769, Lavater wrote again, a little varying his requests. He now addresses Swedenborg as "Most noble, venerable, and beloved, in Christ our Lord;" calls him "a divinely inspired man;" and says, "I revere the wonderful gifts thou hast received of our God: I revere the wisdom that shines forth from thy writings; and therefore cannot but seek the friendship of so great and excellent a man, now living." It does not appear that Swedenborg ever wrote in reply; probably, because he did not like such compliments, and because he did not find in the letter the marks of a solid judgment.

Among the latter believers of Swedenborg's spiritual intercourse, if not of the whole of his doctrine, is certainly to be reckoned the celebrated and eminently pious Vicar of Madeley, the

* See Intellectual Repository, first series, vol. ii. p. 309.

Rev. Mr. Fletcher: but opportunity of setting this fact in its true light will occur in the next PART of this SECTION.

This collection of evidences to the truth of Swedenborg's assertion, that the sight of his spirit had been opened by the Lord, to qualify him for the holy office to which he was called, might still be enlarged; and many instances, no doubt, have sunk into oblivion for want of a recorder. But the above must be amply sufficient to satisfy those whose minds are not closed against all evidence, by a decided rejection of Swedenborg's doctrinal sentiments, or by a confirmed denial of the possibility of any communication between the other world and this. Many, no doubt, will say, with Baron de Grimm; "The facts are attested by authorities so respectable, that it is impossible to deny them: but the question is, how to believe them!" It is best for such persons, that they should reject them: but the humble will judge otherwise, and will not fall into the absurdity of asserting, that that which is incontestible may yet be incredible.

Since the first edition of this work was published, a very important additional testimony in favor of the truth of some of the preceding instances of the spiritual intercourse enjoyed by our Author, has been published in this country, being no other than the declared conviction of their reality, after careful investigation, by the celebrated philosopher, Emanuel Kant. His opinion having been asked by a literary lady of quality, Madame de Knoblock, afterwards widow of Lieut. Gen. Klingsporn, Kant replied in the following letter, dated 10th Aug. 1758.

"I would not have deprived myself so long of the honor and pleasure of obeying the request of a lady, who is the ornament of her sex, in communicating the desired information, if I had not deemed it necessary previously to inform myself thoroughly concerning the subject of your request. Permit me, gracious lady, to justify my proceedings in this matter, inasmuch as it might appear that an erroneous opinion had induced me to credit the various relations concerning it without careful examination. I am not aware that any body has ever perceived in me an inclination to the marvellous, or a weakness approaching to credulity. So much is certain, that, notwithstanding all the narrations of apparitions and visions concerning the spiritual world, of which a great number of the most probable are known to me, I have always considered it to be most in agreement with the rule of sound reason to incline to the negative side; not as if I had imagined such a case to be impossible, although we know but very little concerning the nature of a spirit, but because the instances are not in general sufficiently proved.

Handwritten signature

There arise, moreover, from the incomprehensibility and inutility of this sort of phenomena, too many difficulties ; and there are, on the other hand, so many proofs of deception, that I have never considered it necessary to suffer fear or dread to come upon me, either in the cemeteries of the dead, or in the darkness of night. This is the position in which my mind stood for a long time, until the accounts of Swedenborg came to my notice.

“ These accounts I received from a Danish officer, who was formerly my friend, and attended my lectures ; and who, at the table of the Austrian ambassador, Dietrichstein, at Copenhagen, together with several other guests, read a letter which the ambassador had lately received from Baron de Lutzow, the Mecklenburgh ambassador at Stockholm ; in which he says, that he, in company with the Dutch ambassador, was present at the Queen of Sweden’s residence, at the extraordinary transaction respecting M. de Swedenborg, which your ladyship will undoubtedly have heard. The authenticity thus given to the account surprised me. For it can scarcely be believed, that, one ambassador should communicate a piece of information to another for public use, which related to the queen of the court where he resided, and which he himself, together with a splendid company, had the opportunity of witnessing, if it were not true. Now in order not to reject blindfold the prejudice against apparitions and visions by a new prejudice, I found it desirable to inform myself as to the particulars of this surprising transaction. I accordingly wrote to the officer I have mentioned at Copenhagen, and made various inquiries respecting it. He answered that he had again had an interview concerning it with the Count Dietrichstein ; that the affair had really taken place in the manner described ; and that Professor Schlegel, also, had declared to him, that it could by no means be doubted. He advised me, as he was then going to the army under General St. Germain, to write to Swedenborg himself, in order to ascertain the particular circumstances of the extraordinary case. I then wrote to this singular man, and the letter was delivered to him, at Stockholm, by an English merchant. I was informed that Swedenborg politely received the letter, and promised to answer it. But the answer was omitted. In the mean time I made the acquaintance of an English gentleman who spent the last summer at this place, whom, relying on the friendship we had formed, I commissioned, as he was going to Stockholm, to make particular inquiries respecting the miraculous gift which M. de Swedenborg is said to possess. In his first letter, he states, that the most respectable people in Stockholm declare, that the singular transaction alluded to had happened in the

manner you have heard described. He had not then had an interview with Swedenborg, but hoped soon to embrace the opportunity; although he found it difficult to persuade himself that all could be true which the most reasonable persons of the city asserted, respecting his communication with the spiritual world. But his succeeding letters were quite of a different purport. He had not only spoken with Swedenborg, but had also visited him at his house; and he is now in the greatest astonishment respecting such a remarkable case. Swedenborg is a reasonable, polite, and open-hearted man: he also is a man of learning; and my friend has promised to send me some of his writings in a short time. He told this gentleman, without reserve, that God had accorded to him the remarkable gift of communicating with departed souls at his pleasure. In proof of this he appealed to certain known facts. As he was reminded of my letter, he said that he was aware he had received it, and that he would already have answered it, had he not intended to make the whole of this singular affair public to the eyes of the world. He should proceed to London in the month of May this year, where he would publish a book, in which the answer to my letter, as to every point, might be met with.

“In order, gracious lady, to give you two proofs, of which the present existing public is a witness, and the person who related them to me had the opportunity of investigating them at the very place where they occurred, I will narrate to you the two following occurrences.

[The first of these occurrences is that respecting Madame de Marteville (printed in German work, Harteville), only differing from the relation of it given above from Thiebault, by representing the receipt to have been found, by direction from the deceased M. de Marteville, in a secret drawer of a bureau, which bureau, ignorant of the secret drawer, Mad. de M., had previously searched in vain. The other affair is the fire at Stockholm; and the particulars are given more minutely by Kant than in any account before known in England. He proceeds thus].

“But the following occurrence appears to me to have the greatest weight of proof, and to set the assertion respecting Swedenborg’s extraordinary gift out of all possibility of doubt. In the year 1756, when M. de Swedenborg, towards the end of September, on Saturday, at four o’clock, p. m., arrived at Gothenburg from England, Mr. William Castel invited him to his house, together with a party of fifteen persons. About six o’clock M. de Swedenborg went out, and after a short interval, returned to the company, quite pale and alarmed. He said that a dangerous fire had just broken out in Stockholm, at the Suder-

malm, (Gothenburg is about 50 miles* from Stockholm), and that it was spreading very fast. He was restless, and went out often. He said that the house of one of his friends, whom he named, was already in ashes, and that his own was in danger. At eight o'clock, after he had been out again, he joyfully exclaimed, 'Thank God! the fire is extinguished, the third door from my house.' This news occasioned great commotion through the whole city, and particularly amongst the company in which he was. It was announced to the governor the same evening. On the Sunday morning, Swedenborg was sent for by the governor, who questioned him concerning the disaster. Swedenborg described the fire precisely, how it had begun, in what manner it had ceased, and how long it had continued. On the same day the news was spread through the city, and, as the governor had thought it worthy of attention, the consternation was considerably increased; because many were in trouble on account of their friends and property, which might have been involved in the disaster. On the Monday evening a messenger arrived at Gothenburg, who was dispatched during the time of the fire. In the letters brought by him, the fire was described precisely in the manner stated by Swedenborg. On the Tuesday morning the royal courier arrived at the governor's with the melancholy intelligence of the fire, of the loss which it had occasioned, and of the houses it had damaged and ruined, not in the least differing from that which Swedenborg had given immediately after it had ceased; for the fire was extinguished at eight o'clock.

"What can be brought forward against the authenticity of this occurrence? My friend who wrote this to me has not only examined the circumstances of this extraordinary case at Stockholm, but also, about two months ago, at Gothenburg, where he is acquainted with the most respectable houses, and where he could obtain the most authentic and complete information; as the greatest part of the inhabitants, who are still alive, were witnesses to the memorable occurrence."

"I am, with profound reverence, &c. &c.,

"EMANUEL KANT."†

"Swedenborg's omitting to answer by letter professor Kant's inquiries relating to the above affairs may appear extraordinary. But it is to be remembered, that he never, himself, laid any stress upon these supernatural proofs of the truth of his pretensions; and never does he appeal to them, or so much

* German miles: near 300 English.

† The above letter is taken from a work entitled "*Darstellung des Lebens und Charakters Immanuel Kant's, von Ludwig Ernst Borrowski, von Kant selbst genau rividirt und berichtet.* Königsberg, 1804.

as mention them, in his works. How strong an evidence is this of his elevation of mind ; and of his perfect conviction of the truth of the views he was made an instrument for unfolding, with his own divine appointment to that purpose, as standing in no need of such evidence for its support ! Could it be possible for any of the merely fanatical pretenders to divine communications to appeal to such testimonies of supernatural endowment, how eagerly would they seek to silence objectors by referring to the Queens, Counts, Embassadors, Governors, and University-Professors, that had been witnesses of their power ! But it is precisely on account of the silencing nature of such evidence that Swedenborg declines to appeal to it. — Doubtless, however it was of Divine Providence that occasions arose which constrained him to give him such demonstrations, and that they were recorded by others : because such things serve for *confirmations* of the truth, though they are not the proper grounds of its original reception. When presented also upon testimony, and at a distance of time, they lose that compulsive character which they possess when they take place, or nearly so, before our eyes : and thus they then may become useful to draw the attention of *receptive minds* to the truth, which, when known, may convince by its own evidence.”

That supernatural evidences, at a distance of time, lose that compulsive character which they possess when they take place, or nearly so, before our eyes ; and that minds *not* receptive of the truth, will then throw off the attention to it that was only compulsively induced ; are facts of which Kant himself afforded a melancholy example ; for he afterwards wrote a pamphlet in which he depreciates Swedenborg and his writings. But, as observed by the Editors, when his letter was first published in English in “ The Intellectual Repository.”*

“ On the whole, this letter of Kant must certainly be deemed a very valuable document, and ought to have great weight with all unprejudiced minds. He here, it must be allowed, exhibits the true spirit of a philosopher. Prejudiced, at first, like most men of science, against all belief in spiritual intercourse, he consents, on finding a *prima facie* case made out in favor of that of Swedenborg, to investigate the matter thoroughly : he does so ; and comes at last to the conclusion, that some of the

* For January, 1830, from which some of the preceding remarks are abridged. See all that there is said upon Kant and his system, p. 57 — 62. For what he afterwards wrote against Swedenborg, with an exposure of its utter futility, see pp. 197, 198, 199, of the No. for July, 1834 ; being part of an article, bearing the signature of *Ægioclus*, in which I examined the objections raised against Swedenborg’s “ inspiration,” in the *American Christian Examiner*, by Dr. Hedge, of Harvard University.

respecting the performance of the last judgment, as evidenced by the late and present state of the world, only tend to confirm it.

The writer of "The Trial" again repeats his admission, and his conclusion from it, thus: "That we are entered upon *a new era, and a very important one*, is true. The altered spirit and atrocious demoralization of the times show it, as well as the advancement of our age in *the science of good and evil*. But all this is no proof of the existence of St. John's and Isaiah's *holy city—the New Jerusalem, or its being already upon earth*; but it agrees well enough with Swedenborg's."* Very true. It *does* agree with Swedenborg's for Swedenborg never said that the New Jerusalem, strictly speaking, was "*already upon earth*," but only, that it was *preparing to descend*. But he affirmed that the Lord's second advent was commencing, and that the last judgment, as connected with it, had in the spiritual world been performed: and this adversary acknowledges the change of state in the natural world, discernible by all, to be so great, as obviously to announce *a new and very important era*. How extraordinary does it appear, that, seeing this, he cannot acknowledge the only adequate cause! But the Scripture must be fulfilled: "Every eye shall see him; and they also which pierced him."† They see, indeed, what cannot be regarded as any thing less than the effects of the Lord's second coming: but they refuse to acknowledge him in them: spiritually they pierce him still; or deny him, by falsifying his truth.

But before closing this PART of this SECTION, we must notice another subject.

Wishing, as far as possible, to avoid, in this Appeal, repeating what has been said by others, I have not yet, in stating the reasons why no direct miracles were performed by Swedenborg, dwelt much upon those offered by Swedenborg himself, and which have been most urged by his vindicators. I thus have not urged the most important of all,—their tendency to close the rational mind. This, however, ought not to be passed by; and to treat a subject which has been handled by such writers as Hindmarsh and Clowes with as much originality as possible, I will do it by subjoining an extract from an address drawn up by me for a certain occasion (but not used) in the year 1799; at which time I had not read any thing on the question but what is contained in our author's own writings, with which I had become acquainted the preceding year. There is more warmth in the manner than I should use now; but this the reader will excuse in a youthful production; written too at a

* P. 198.

† Rev. i. 7.

time when the delight accompanying the perception of new truths was in all its freshness, and when I literally was filled with astonishment that what appeared to me clearer than the light of the meridian sun should not be seen by others.

“Some, probably, will say, ‘What argument can induce us to believe a man in a concern of this nature who gives no visible credentials to his authority? A teacher commissioned from on high ought to have the power of working miracles. — Had we seen him raise a dead corpse to life, or jump unhurt from the Monument, we might have believed him; but without such proofs as these we cannot.’ But let us ask in return, Is it worthy of a being wearing the figure of a man to require such proofs as these to determine his judgment? Are we not endowed with rationality? Is it not by virtue of this celestial spark that man boasts himself a man, and claims superiority over every other rank of animated nature? The lower orders of creation have bodily senses as well as we: they can see, hear, feel, taste, and smell: and if we, refusing to exercise those faculties which we possess in common with angels, receive only such evidence as our external senses can grasp, do we not degrade the dignity of our nature, deny our heavenly origin, and reduce ourselves to a level with the beasts that grovel on the ground? The beasts act from the impulse of their bodily senses, but are utterly incapable of seeing from reason why they should so act: and it might easily be shown, that while a man thinks and acts under the influence of a miracle, he is as much incapable of perceiving, from any rational ground, why he should thus think and act, as a beast is.

“‘What!’ our opponents will perhaps reply, ‘Dare any one speak thus disrespectfully of miracles, when they are sanctioned by the testimony of the Bible? Was it not entirely by miracles that the Jewish Church was established? Was it not by miracles that the Israelites were induced to believe Moses? Was it not by miracles that they were governed in the wilderness? And was it not by miracles that the prophets sometimes testified their authority? Do you not believe these facts?’ — Yes, my friends, I do most entirely believe them: and at the same time I most ardently hope that none of us are such people as the Jews were; because the most stupendous miracles would then do us no more good than they did them. For can we have a more conclusive evidence of the inadequacy of miracles to convince a man to his real benefit, than in the conduct of that people; who, notwithstanding the wonderful things which they daily saw were continually rebellious, insomuch that, we are informed, they were stiff-necked above all the people on the face of the earth? — ‘If then the Jews were not amend.

Discrepancy in authority

by those means, what end did they answer?' — Let us consider what end was answered in their being introduced into the land of Canaan: for how can we suppose that a people of this character ever constituted a real spiritual church?* And how can we imagine that they could ever be, in a peculiar manner, the express favorites of God? — 'But if not, why did he interpose in so wonderful a manner to deliver them from Egypt?' — We answer; They were delivered from Egypt, which was a type of the natural state of man, and introduced into Canaan, which was a type of his spiritual state, that they might represent all that belongs to a real spiritual church by their ceremonial worship and particular transactions; and that, by their means, a revelation might be given to the world, which in its literal sense, should treat of their affairs and of those of the neighboring nations, their wars, rites, and customs; all which spiritually signified such things as relate to the real spiritual church: and because they could not be brought even to represent such a church by superior inducements, they were driven and forced to it by miracles; which, likewise, were all representatives of spiritual subjects.

"But it may be objected, 'That supposing the Jews were a gross, external people, who did little more than represent a spiritual church, the Christian was an interior dispensation; and yet miracles were wrought at its establishment, both by Christ and his Apostles.' But let us remember, that the Lord passed his whole life upon earth among the Jews, who, being such a people as has just been described, required testifications of this sort; which here also, as well as in the case of the miracles wrought by Moses, had a spiritual signification. Besides, the Word of the New Testament, wherein they are recorded, was yet to be written; and every sickness and infirmity therein described to have been healed, was representative of some evil or false principle which only the divine power of the Lord is able to remove. If this were not the reason, why is not this power continued to the dignitaries of the church till this day? We see that it is not: we find that, as soon as the Christians were entirely separated from the Jews, miracles ceased.

"But now, at the opening of a more interior dispensation than either of the former, — of a spiritual form of the everlasting gospel — no miracles are performed at all. Is not the reason yet evident? Let me ask any person whatever, whether he can be forced to think what he does not think, or to love what he does not love? It is true that, by the civil laws of a state, or anything which occasions fear, a man may be forced to say

* See what is said on this subject in "The Plenary Inspiration," &c., p. 404, 414.

Significance of the his. of the Jews

what he does not think, and to do what he does not love : yet, notwithstanding this, he does not think and love what he thus says and does ; and were the constraint removed, he would immediately speak and act otherwise. Now, though such conduct as this may indeed answer the purpose of the civil life, do we not see that, with respect to the spiritual life, it is nothing ? A man, may by civil and ecclesiastical enactments, be restrained from speaking against the truths of religion and outwardly transgressing its laws ; yea, he may be, and in some countries is, forced to acknowledge and obey them : yet if his knowledge and obedience proceed only from such a cause, what is his religion ? It is evident, that unless a man really thinks what he speaks, and loves what he acts, there is nothing of the man in such speech and action. Hence it may appear, that the essential human principle, or that by virtue of which man is man, consists in the liberty of thinking and willing ; and that if this liberty were taken from him, which would be the case were he constantly under the influence of a miracle, he would no longer, properly speaking, be a man at all. If we see a beast of prey destroying another animal, do we reprobate him as guilty of moral evil ? No, we do not : we are sensible that he is gratifying a natural appetite, which he has no liberty of will to resist. But if we see a man commit an act of cruelty or injustice, we do reprobate him as guilty of moral evil : we are sensible that reason might have taught him it was wrong, and that he was at liberty, had he pleased to obey her dictates. If, then, we thus confess it to be these faculties which raise us from mere animals to men, how ought we to disdain to seek an influence, which, by depriving us of them, would reduce us from men to mere animals ! And such is the influence of miracles. For if, when we have rejected a truth, the operation of a miracle force us to acknowledge it ; is there any thing of true faith in such acknowledgment ? True faith must reside in the rational mind : but the miracle, acting only on the external senses, actually shuts up the rational mind ; so that, astounded in a stupid amaze, we become utterly incapable of looking at what is thus forced upon us in any light of reason, or of receiving it in any affection. Wherefore the miracle becomes quite useless : for finding ourselves, while its impression remains, deprived of our freedom, — bereaved of the faculties which constitute us men, — we willingly suffer it to wear off : and thus being restored to our liberty, we confirm anew what *our* reason dictates ; we return to our former belief, because it is what we think, and what we like to think. But that we may see this as clearly as possible, let us take an example. Suppose a man, having no affection for goodness,

divine liberty

to be forced by a miracle to acknowledge a truth which he otherwise would reject: will he behold this truth with pleasure, even though it teach the way to happiness? Assuredly not. And why? Because he wishes to find happiness some other way. For this (inasmuch as it is a truth) teaches, that, to be truly happy, we must be good, and renounce the pursuit of such enjoyments as are grounded in the love of evil: but he, being devoted to the pursuit of such enjoyments, which he feels as his very life, will regard as an enemy whatsoever opposes it. Finding himself therefore under an irksome restraint in the prosecution of his favorite pleasures, from the monitory voice of the truth he has acknowledged, he will shortly reject it as founded in error; and he will deny the miracle which induced his belief, by persuading himself that it was the accidental effect of some natural cause with which he is unacquainted; or perhaps, that it proceeded from the agency of powers which delight in deceiving mankind.

“Let us, then, not wish to have our minds closed by miracles, but let us open them by rational investigation. If we are desirous to know whether the doctrines now promulgated are consistent with truth, let us search for them in Moses and the prophets; for these are they which testify of them; and if we believe not Moses and the prophets, neither should we be persuaded though one rose from the dead. These are the Lord’s own words; which I remind you of, to evince, that the reasons I have offered to demonstrate the inutility of miracles as evidences of spiritual truth, are derived from Him who cannot err. Let us remember that he also assures us, that it is an evil and adulterous generation which seeketh after a sign. Let us remember likewise, and tremble lest we resemble them, that the Jews, who were such a generation, were not convinced by the signs when they beheld them. Of this, what an awful instance they gave when they crucified the Lord! ‘Come down from the cross,’ they cried out, ‘and we will believe thee.’ Did he not perform the miracle they demanded as the condition of their faith? Nay, did he not perform a much greater miracle? He raised his glorified body from the grave: the Jews knew it: and they bribed the guard to say it had been stolen by his disciples!

“No, my friends, believe me! it is not by miracles that disciples are to be gained for the New Jerusalem. The real inhabitants of this ‘holy city’ are to be *interiorly* principled in wisdom and goodness: and it is not in the power of a thousand miracles to affect the interiors of the mind, or to remove one evil which is rooted there. Let us, then, remember we are men, and look for such evidences as become the capacities

of men ; which are, truths that recommend themselves to an enlightened reason : and of these rational evidences there is no lack to accredit the testimony of Baron Swedenborg.”*

Upon the whole, I trust, that all the Candid and Reflecting will agree with me in the conviction, that Swedenborg, by the non-performance of miracles, has in no degree weakened his claims to attention, but that he would have weakened them much more had he wrought the most “notable” ones. Even under the Mosaic law, abounding, as that dispensation did, with outward wonders, the performance of them is never laid down as among the credentials of a prophet ; while, on the other hand, their exhibition by false prophets is spoken of as possible and probable : “If there arise among you a prophet or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder come to pass whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods which we have not known, and let us serve them ; thou shalt not hearken unto the voice of that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams.”† Thus the knowledge of God, as revealed, of course in his Word, is spoken of as the only infallible touch-stone. So in Isaiah : “To the law and to the testimony : if they speak not according to this word, it is because they have no light in them.”‡ To the same purpose is the wise answer of Abraham in the parable : “They have Moses and the prophets : let them hear them. — If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.”§ And the Lord himself : “Search the Scriptures ; for in them ye think ye have eternal life ; and they are they which testify of me — Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me : for he wrote of me.”|| It is to this testimony that Swedenborg appeals. As the “harbin-

* See also some remarks upon the unsatisfying nature of the evidence from miracles in the preface to “The Plenary Inspiration,” &c. I had there said, in reference to those defences of Christianity which build chiefly on that evidence, that they “are more adapted to silence than to satisfy even an ingenuous inquirer.” The observation has been caviled at by some of the Reviewers ; but I have since had the satisfaction of finding precisely the same idea, in nearly the same phraseology, expressed by Mr. T. Erskine, in his very popular work, “Remarks on the Internal Evidence for the truth of the Christian Religion. “We generally find,” says that amiable writer, “that the objections which are urged by sceptics against the inspiration of the Bible, are founded on some apparent improbability in the detached parts of the system. These objections are often repelled by the defenders of Christianity as irrelevant ; and the objectors are referred to the unbroken and well-supported line of testimony in confirmation of its miraculous history. *This may be a silencing argument, but it is not a convincing one.*” (P. 200, Ed. 1828.)

† Deut. xiii. 1, 2. 8.

‡ Ch. viii. 20.

§ Luke xvi. 29, 31.

|| John v. 39, 46.

ger" of the Lord at his first advent preached of, and pointed to, the Word made flesh and they who thence were led to Jesus acknowledged, that, though "John did no miracle, all things that he said of this man were true;" so does the Herald of the second advent point to the Lord in his Word; and they who, guided by his directions, seek him there, will assuredly find, that, though Swedenborg did no miracle, all that he has said of the presence of the Lord therein, in the power and glory of its spiritual sense, is true also. And the one is as great a divine discovery as the other. As it was impossible for John, without illumination from above, to have known in his true character the Word in person, so it was impossible for Swedenborg, without illumination from above, to have known the true character of the written Word of God,—to have seen how it makes a one with the living Word himself; being a derivation from him in the inmost of which he is, and by the opening of the internal sense of which he is bringing himself nearer than ever to mankind, and granting to them a nearer access to him. It would be idle, I admit, to talk in this manner, if the views of Scripture given in the writings of Swedenborg differed not from those of commentators in general,—if they contained nothing beyond what learning and study and piety might discover: but if they exhibit far more than this; if they present the Word in a light completely new and transcendantly glorious; if they prove that it includes throughout a regular spiritual sense, which, without superseding that of the letter immensely exalts and dignifies the whole, displaying it to the enchanted eye of reason as well as of faith as the very Divine Truth and Wisdom,—as, without a figure, the Word of God indeed; then surely it will be conceded, that flesh and blood could not have revealed this unto him, but he must have received it by special illumination from the living Word himself. No miracle can rival, in the clearness of the conviction produced, the revelation and rational apprehension of previously hidden truth: and he who enjoys this interior conviction of truth would not feel it more strongly, were he to behold the most stupendous miracles performed by the Human Instrument of conveying it. Many superior minds have seen, that miracles have no tendency to enlighten the understanding; and the remark of that extraordinary genius, Rousseau, was not less profound than it was brilliant, when he said that, he believed the gospel itself, not on account of its miracles, but in spite of them.

SECTION V.

A HUMAN INSTRUMENT NECESSARY, AND THEREFORE RAISED UP.

PART IV.

The Charge against Swedenborg of Mental Derangement, Considered ; With some Minor Objections.

We now come to the grand objection of all against the illustrious Swedenborg, and his claims to be accepted in the character he assumes. The common cry, re-echoed from mouth to mouth, and retailed from pen to pen, is, that he was mad ; an aspersion which, notwithstanding some totally false and merely calumnious tales have from time to time been fabricated to support it, literally rests upon no foundation whatever, but that on which the same imputation was thrown against an infinitely greater character. "He hath a devil and is mad : why hear ye him?"* Such was the salutation with which the Divine Truth, in person, was assailed, when "he came unto his own, and his own received him not." The Lord Jesus himself was reproached as insane by the leaders of the professing church of that day : and even his own kindred according to the flesh had so little conception of his true character, that when he began to display it by mighty words and works, "they said ; He is beside himself. And they went forth to lay hold on him,"† for the purpose of putting him under restraint, as a person of disordered mind. So little capable, when in the darkness of its sensual perceptions, is the human mind, of distinguishing the most exalted wisdom from insanity ! No wonder then that the proclaimer of genuine truth now should be derided with similar reproaches. "The disciple is not above his Master, nor the servant above his Lord ; if they call the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more them of his household !"‡ Such were the prophetic warnings by which the Lord prepared his disciples for the treatment they were to expect : and the experience of distant ages has proved their truth. When the apostle pleaded the cause of Christianity before Agrippa and Festus, the Roman governor replied with the exclamation, "Paul, thou art beside thyself ; much learning doth make thee mad : "§ and so, in our times, a man who has been favored with a degree of illumination as much superior to that of modern Christians in

* John x. 20. † Mark iii. 21. ‡ Matt. x. 24, 25. § Acts. xxvi. 24.

general as was the divine knowledge of Paul to the darkness which then overspread both Jews and Gentiles, is assailed with the same cry, and, while his attainments in science are admitted, it is pretended that his studies had ruined his faculties. By the Candid and Reflecting, a sufficient answer to this charge will be found in his writings, which, though a period of twenty-two years intervened between the publication of the first of his theological works and the last, exhibit the most perfect consistency of sentiment throughout, while they are all written with a regard to the most orderly and methodical arrangement, and display in their author the most acute powers of reason and extraordinary strength of memory ; which last faculty is evinced by the numerous references to other parts of his works which abound in them all. These, certainly, are qualities which do not usually attend the ebullitions of insanity. Indeed, it is impossible to pretend to find in the composition and manner of Swedenborg's writings any tokens of derangement: even adversaries admit that they exhibit plain marks of a very superior mind: and they only pronounce him mad, *because his works contain such statements as they might naturally be expected to contain, should his claims to acceptance as a heaven-commissioned teacher, be true.**

* I had here, however, almost forgotten the Author of the Anti-Swedenborg; for he, willing to be thought a more profound critic than any who had gone before him, objects to the manner, as well as the matter, of Swedenborg's writings. He complains that there is in them "an almost endless tautology and repetition either of expression or meaning," which he adds, "is to me, another plain indication of the author's disordered intellect." (P. 7). But his proof of the charge is not a little curious. "Lest," he says, "I should be charged with misrepresentation respecting those repetitions and tautologies, I will give one instance. No. 332, Memorable Relation, *True Christian Religion*, — No. 331, Memorable Relation, *Conjugal Love*. These two memorable relations, which I find in two different works, are word for word." Now repetition or tautology consists in repeating the same thing, in the same work, over again, in the same or in different words. To do this unconsciously, or without necessity, is certainly a mark of a weak head ; but to indicate disordered intellects, it must be done in such a manner as to produce, not prolix exactness, but confusion. Not the least trace of tautologies and repetitions of either of these kinds, is to be found in the writings of Swedenborg. But in an extensive work it frequently becomes necessary to repeat something which has been said before, when it is to form the premises to further conclusions: and in different works on similar subjects this is still more unavoidable. Such repetitions as these certainly exist in the writings of Swedenborg; and they evince, not the disorder, but the exactness, of his intellect. But to give, in Appendices to different works, the same relation or discussion, not as forming part of the series of the work, but because the author deems it illustrative or important, — though it is a repetition, it hardly comes under the description of what is critically so denominated: it is rather a second edition of an isolated tract ; and he who possesses both editions,

If Swedenborg really had the senses of his spirit so opened, as to be present with angels and spirits as one of themselves, in the same manner as is experienced by all men when they have finally quitted the terrestrial body, it is abundantly certain that, if he should relate what he witnessed, he must relate much which, to common apprehensions, must appear extraordinary, — perhaps incredible. Now his adversaries in general only look into his works for such things as may serve to give a wrong impression. These they set forth as specimens of the whole, for the purpose of deterring others from examining for themselves; carefully suppressing those excellent and truly sublime and heavenly sentiments, upon numerous subjects of the first importance, which even they cannot help feeling, and half acknowledging, that those writings contain. Thus respecting some sentiments of our author, which an adversary cannot deny to be excellent, he has these remarks: “What the Baron says respecting truth and good, and especially what he says respecting faith and charity, [these are fundamental things, by the by], as also his opinion respecting man’s free-will and predestination, accords in general with my sentiments, and may perhaps be read with some advantage.”* We here have, to be sure, an admirable specimen of what Pope calls to

“damn with faint praise;”

yet we may be satisfied that there must be something truly striking in what Swedenborg delivers on these subjects, to extort even such praise from a person determined, when looking at his excellencies, to apply the wrong end of the telescope, while for discovering what might be distorted into blemishes, he uses the strongest magnifier he could find. Accordingly, he immediately adds, “But on these subjects the Bible may always be consulted with infinitely more success; therefore quitting the Bible for Baron Swedenborg’s works, is something like leaving good wine for mere water.” Can any thing be more futile? Must not an adversary be sadly at a loss for an objection to offer such a one as this? All that has ever been written in illustration of the Bible, is, it seems, mere waste paper!

seeing at once that they contain the same thing, will not read it again unless he wishes to do so. Now the example on which the writer rests his charge of tautology and repetition is one of this sort. It is an isolated relation given in the Appendices to the chapters of two different works, because in the last of them, the author wished to collect together all that he had written of the kind. Thus this objector, when endeavoring to avert from himself the charge of misrepresentation, completely establishes it.

* Anti-Swedenborg, pp. 7, 8.

The Bible not only contains all things necessary to salvation, but all so plainly stated, that every reader, learned or unlearned may comprehend the whole without assistance!* He adds "If we will read uninspired books upon these subjects, there are plenty to be found more compact and consolidated than the Baron's writings, which are frequently both diffuse and incoherent." This last imputation I utterly deny. I defy any man to produce a fair example of incoherence from any part of our author's numerous volumes. If there be, occasionally, some diffuseness in his style, it arose from his desire to avoid ambiguity; he doubtless would rather seem prolix than obscure. But prolixity is by no means the general characteristic of his composition; it in fact seldom appears but in the uniform and formal mode in which he introduces his comments on each clause of the subject in his expositions of the Scriptures. Besides, who can judge of his style, that only knows it through the very disadvantageous medium of a literal translation? In the original, it is often so condensed, that it is difficult fully to render the sense in English without greatly weakening it by dilution. I appeal as an example to the Latin of the work "On the New Jerusalem, and its Heavenly Doctrine;" which is a production truly admirable for the consolidated weight of its matter, and the correspondingly brief and sententious character of its style. But in respect to works like his, in which the matter is every thing, it only displays a previous determination

* This brings to my recollection the following anecdote.

Mr. Samuel Warren, the father of the Dr. Warren who has made such a schism in the Methodist body, and who was himself attached to that body for fifty years, had, several years before his decease, which happened in 1838, embraced the views of the New Church. "When it was known among the Methodists that he had received the new doctrine, they deputed the Rev. J. Wood one of their most influential ministers, to wait on him, and dissuade him from reading the writings of E. S. When the reverend gentleman entered, the following dialogue took place: 'Well, brother Warren, I hope you read your Bible?' 'Yes, bless the Lord, I do read it, and understand it too, more than ever.' But (says Mr. Wood) I hope you do not read any foolish books: the Bible, the Bible only, is the book for you; read nothing but your Bible.' 'Surely (replied the other) there can be no harm in my reading a little in the Methodist Magazine, or Wesley's sermons?' 'Well, no (said Mr. Wood); but do not read foolish and visionary books.' 'I suppose you mean Swedenborg's (added Mr. Warren): but I tell you I shall not cease to read them unless they are proved to be false: till then, sir, neither brass, nor silver, nor iron, nor even Wood, shall hinder me from reading those works from which I derive good. If you approve of Wesley, I approve of Swedenborg.' "

(See *Int. Rep.* for May, 1833, p. 436). What says the *Warrenite* to this, who has recently disgraced himself by re-compounding a sarrago of oft-refuted slanders, — Mr. Roebuck?

to be displeased, when an opponent descends to cavil about the manner; and a man who wishes to be regarded as a friend of religion in general, ought, before he resorts to such cavils, to consider whom they will hit besides. It is long ago since Jerome noticed the solecisms of Paul; and it is well known that none of the writers of the New Testament possessed a good Greek style: but who that pretends to a grain of candor regards this as derogating from the importance of their writings? Who will say that, because, as to the composition, their Epistles are not faultless, there is reason to impute "disordered intellects" to the Apostles? Let Swedenborg's writings be looked at for their *sentiments*, and be judged of by them: and we fear not to assert, that they will be found to contain a system of theology, which, instead of being, like that of his opponents, at open variance with half the Bible and really at variance with all the rest, is in perfect harmony with the whole; and, what is no less important, a system which, differently from all others, harmonizes all the Bible with itself.

Most unjust, then, in every respect, is the representation which many of our opponents have given of the writings of Swedenborg. It is fabled of the cruel Medea, that to stop her incensed father in his pursuit, she tore her tender brother Absyrtes limb from limb, and strewed the way with his mangled remains: thus, also, has Swedenborg been treated by his adversaries, to turn the sincere seeker from the pursuit of truth. Several of them, probably, exult in the dexterity with which they have performed this feat. Cheered by the plaudits of sectarian magazines, more than one mutilator probably says in his heart, something like what the notorious T. Paine has said in his "Age of Reason," on completing a not dissimilar exploit: "I have now gone through the Bible, as a man would go through a wood, with an axe on his shoulder, and fell trees. Here they lie; and the priests, if they can, may replant them. They may perhaps stick them in the ground again, but they will never grow." So easy is it, by overlooking the design of the whole together, and taking detached passages out of their connection, to hold up to ridicule any thing whatsoever, even the eternal Word of truth itself; and so easy is it likewise for men, when they have done this, to persuade themselves that the objects of their scorn deserve it. This is just what several adversaries have done with the illustrious Swedenborg and his writings: they create deformities, and then call upon their readers to bestow on them their contempt.

"Trunca sed ostendens disjectis corpora membris,
Aspice ait." —

One of them denominates his specimens, "Sundry Extracts from the writings of Baron Swedenborg." "If" "Sundry," means *sundered*, the title is truly descriptive. A scrap is taken from one place, and a scrap from another, while all the explanations necessary for the understanding of them are omitted: and the reader is solicited to condemn the Author on account of the grotesque dress in which his antagonist presents him. Suppose a man were to steal into the wardrobe of a prince, and cutting off a snip from one elegant garment, and a snip from another, were to patch them together in the form of a fool's coat; what should we think of him if he were to exhibit his motley compound, his thing of shreds and patches, as a dress of the prince's, instead of acknowledging that it was merely his own? Just as good an idea would such a piece of patch-work present of a royal robe, as do the extracts furnished by our adversaries, in general, of the writings of Swedenborg. They endeavor, by garbled quotations, to make him appear ridiculous or unintelligible, and then they call upon the public to pronounce him mad. Return, however, the fragments to their proper places, and read them in their proper order; and the reason of the whole will appear; and then his writings, instead of lending any countenance to the imputation of insanity, completely refute it, and evince his heaven-born intelligence.*

II. As then there is really no ground in the works of Swedenborg themselves, viewed as the productions of a man specially called to discharge a divine commission, on which to found the imputation of mental derangement: and as this will more conclusively appear when we come, in the next Section, to consider the statements in his works most relied on for supporting such an imputation; we will proceed to examine the principal of the alleged facts, out of which the calumnious report has been constructed.

It has given much pain to the receivers of the doctrines communicated in the writings of Swedenborg, that the circulation of the report of his insanity should have been materially promoted by a man so much entitled to respect as the late Rev. Mr. Wesley. It is however certain, that in the part which that respectable person took in the affair, he was completely imposed upon by the minister of the Swedish Chapel in London, Mr. Mathesius, who was Swedenborg's personal and violent enemy. Mr. Wesley, indeed, professes to give his statement on the authority of a Mr. Brockmer, as well as of Mathesius: this, however, was only because Mathesius *told* him that he derived his information from Brockmer, but this, Brockmer *totally denied*.

* This shall be illustrated, in the sequel, in the case of the specially *Sundered Extracts* above adverted to.

The substance of the account published from Mathesius by Mr. Wesley, is, that while lodging at the house of Mr. Brockmer, in the year 1743, Swedenborg was seized with a violent fever, attended with delirium; and the inference drawn from it is, that though he recovered from the fever, he never recovered from the delirium. But how completely unauthorized is such a conclusion! Is it usual with that common malady, — a fever attended with delirium, — to leave the faculties deranged after the patient's recovery? The story itself, also, refutes the inference which the relators draw from it. For to prove that he once was actually delirious, or "mad," they tell us (though nobody pretends to have seen it) that he played the mad trick of running naked into the street, exclaiming that he was the Messiah, and rolling himself in the mire. Now as it is abundantly certain that his conduct through all his after life was the most decorous possible, — as he completely left off playing mad tricks (supposing he ever had played any), — the proper inference is, that he ceased to be mad. In the judicious words of Mr. Hartley, "He was seized with a fever, attended with a delirium, common in that case, about twenty years before he died, and was under the care of a physician; and they have gone about to pick up what he said and did, and how he looked at the time, and have propagated this both in private and in print; a proceeding so contrary to common humanity, that one cannot think of it without offence, nay, even horror: but there is not the least occasion for a particular answer to so malignant a charge, as it receives its full confutation from the consistency and wisdom of his numerous publications before and since that time."* The justice of these remarks is indisputable, supposing the story of the fever and delirium to be true: but what shall we think, if the whole story was merely fabricated to give a color to the charge? This, there is actually the strongest reason for believing. There is no trace of any allusion to the tale in any authentic source of information: and the Chevalier de Sandel, we have seen above,† not only declares, that Swedenborg, "being endowed with a strength of faculties truly extraordinary, in the decline of his age, soared to the greatest heights to which the intellectual faculty can rise," — for this might be the case notwithstanding his having had a fever and delirium, — but he asserts, further,‡ that "he enjoyed such excellent health, that he scarcely ever experienced the slightest indisposition." Could this general assertion have been made, if so terrible an exception to it had ever happened? In short, what with the inherent inconsist-

* Preface to the translation of the *True Christian Religion*.

† P. 191.

‡ P. 194.

encies in the story itself, and the virtual refutation of it by Sandel, there is enough to evince its utter falsehood, could no direct contradiction of it be given. But such direct contradiction of it, taken from the lips of Mr. Brockmer, does exist, testified by the Rev. R. Hindmarsh, who was still living to confirm it when this Appeal was first published.* Thus the whole origin of the story was evidently no more than this: Swedenborg mentioned freely to Brockmer the commencement of his spiritual intercourse: Brockmer talked of it: and from the idle reports which thus got abroad, Mathesius, *nearly forty years afterwards*, fabricated the tale with which he imposed on Mr. Wesley. This fact is alone sufficient to fix the brand of imposture on the whole story. *The charge against Swedenborg of mental derangement, is built upon circumstances alleged to have occurred forty years before the charge was brought forward, and which had never been heard of in the whole of the intermediate period!* What more palpable mark of fabrication could exist?

But if from the story of the fever and delirium, assumed as true, any should continue to argue that Swedenborg remained insane ever after; with much more plausibility might it be argued, that a man who became positively insane, and continued the remainder of his life in that state, might have been partially deranged long before it was suspected: and if so, we could easily account for Mathesius' *imagining* the tale he propagated; for that *he went mad*, is a well-authenticated fact. We are by no means prone to assume the distribution of divine judgments; but it really is difficult to avoid thinking that we behold one here. All must allow it to be a remarkable coincidence, that the man who first imputed insanity to Swedenborg, and was the chief cause of its being believed by others, should himself have experienced the deplorable visitation; which happened also, soon after he gave the *information* to Mr. Wesley. The *Abrege des Ouvrages d' Em. Swedenborg*, which was published at Stockholm in 1788, states in the preface, that Mathesius had become insane, and was then living in that state *in that city*. The same is affirmed in "The New Jerusalem Magazine;" one of the editors of which was Mr. C. B. Wadstrom, a Swedish gentleman of great respectability, well known for his efforts in the cause of the abolition of the

* See his excellent work entitled, "A vindication of the Character and writings of the Hon. Eman. Swedenborg," &c., pp. 19, 20. See, also, the *New Magazine of Knowledge*, for 1791, which not only contains a refutation, by the late Mr. Robert Beatson, of the above story, but of the principal of the strange misrepresentations of Swedenborg's sentiments published by Mr. Wesley in the *Arminian Magazine*.

slave-trade, and who must have had ample means of knowing the fact. In a MS. minute, also, in my possession,* of a conversation held by Mr. Provo, May 2nd, 1787, with Mr. Bergstrom, master of the king's Arms (Swedish) Hotel in Wellclose Square, the latter says as follows: "Mr. Mathesius was an opponent of Swedenborg, and said that he was a lunatic, &c.; but it is remarkable that he went lunatic himself; which happened one day when he was in the Swedish church and about to preach: *I was there and saw it*: he has been so ever since, and sent back to Sweden, where he now is: this was about four years ago." All the accounts agree: and thus evident it is, that into the pit which this unhappy man digged for another, did he fall himself. (Mr. Bergstrom also said of Swedenborg, with much more that is creditable to him, "He frequently called on me, and once lived ten weeks together with me in this house; during which time I observed nothing in him but what was very reasonable, and bespoke the gentleman. — Some of his friends here spoke against him, and some were for him: for my own part, I think he was a reasonable, sensible, and good man; he was very kind to all and generous to me").

But, further: I am providentially enabled, by some documents which have come into my hands, to trace the progress of Mr. Wesley's mind in regard to Swedenborg, in such a manner, as completely to neutralize his authority in the unfavorable conclusion which he, at last, adopted: for I am enabled to show, that, in that conclusion, Mr. Wesley stands in direct opposition to Mr. Wesley himself; and that his first judgment was formed upon far better evidence than his last. It appears certain, that Mr. Wesley was at one time inclined to receive Swedenborg's testimony in the fullest manner: and this *because he had had indubitable experience of his supernatural knowledge*.

Among Mr. Wesley's preachers, in the year 1772, was the late Mr. Samuel Smith, a man of great piety and integrity, who afterwards became one of the first ministers in our church. Having heard a curious anecdote, said to rest on his authority, I wrote to Mr. J. I. Hawkins, the well-known Engineer, who had been intimately acquainted with Mr. Smith, to request an exact account of it. The following (a little abbreviated) is his answer: it is dated February 6th, 1826.

"Dear Sir,—In answer to your enquiries, I am able to state, that I have a clear recollection of having repeatedly heard the Rev. Samuel Smith say, about the year 1787, or 1788, That in the latter end of February, 1772, he, with some

* Since printed at length in the *Intellectual Repository* for January, 1830.

other preachers, was in attendance upon the Rev. John Wesley, taking instructions and assisting him in the preparations for his great Circuit, which Mr. Wesley was about to commence : that while thus in attendance, a letter came to Mr. Wesley, which he perused with evident astonishment : that, after a pause, he read the letter to the company ; and that it was couched in nearly the following words :*

' Great Bath Street, Cold Bath Fields, Feb. — 1772.

' Sir, — I have been informed in the world of spirits that you have a strong desire to converse with me ; I shall be happy to see you if you will favor me with a visit.

*' I am Sir, your humble servant,
' EMAN. SWEDENBORG.'*

" Mr. Wesley frankly acknowledged to the company, that he had been very strongly impressed with a desire to see and converse with Swedenborg, and that he had never mentioned that desire to any one.

" Mr. Wesley wrote for answer, that he was then closely occupied in preparing for a six months' journey, but would do himself the pleasure of waiting upon Mr. Swedenborg soon after his return to London.

" Mr. Smith further informed me, that he afterwards learned that Swedenborg wrote in reply, that the visit proposed by Mr. Wesley would be too late, as he, Swedenborg, should go into the world of spirits on the 29th day of the next month, never more to return.

" Mr. Wesley went the Circuit, and on his return to London, [if not, as is most probable, before], was informed of the fact, that Swedenborg had departed this life on the 29th of March preceding.

" This extraordinary correspondence induced Mr. Smith to examine the writings of Swedenborg ; and the result was, a firm conviction of the rationality and truth of the heavenly doctrines promulgated in those invaluable writings, which doctrines he zealously labored to disseminate during the remainder of his natural life.

" That Mr. Smith was a man of undoubted veracity, can be testified by several persons now living, besides myself ; the fact therefore that such a correspondence did take place between the Honorable Emanuel Swedenborg and the Rev. John Wesley, is established upon the best authority.

" On referring to Mr. Wesley's printed journal it may be seen, that he left London on the first of March in the year

* The letter was most probably in Latin ; but Mr. Wesley, no doubt, would read it in English.

1772; reached Bristol on the 3rd, Worcester on the 14th, and Chester on the 29th, which was the day of Swedenborg's final departure from this world. Mr. Wesley, in continuing his circuit, visited *Liverpool*, and various towns in the north of England, and in Scotland, returning through Northumberland and Durham to Yorkshire, and thence through Derbyshire, Staffordshire, and Shropshire, to Wales; thence to Bristol, Salisbury, Winchester, and Portsmouth, to London, where he arrived on the 10th of October in the same year, having been absent rather more than six months.

"I feel it my duty to accede to your request, and allow my name to appear as your immediate voucher.

"I remain, Dear Sir, your's very sincerely.

"JOHN ISAAC HAWKINS."

To this I can add, that the Rev. M. Sibly has assured me, that he has heard Mr. Smith relate the above anecdote; and that he could mention, if necessary, several other persons still living who must have heard it too. He fully, also, supports Mr. Hawkins' statement in regard to Mr. Smith's veracity. Thus it is impossible to doubt that Mr. Smith affirmed it; and it is difficult to suppose that he could either wilfully or unintentionally misrepresent an incident which must have impressed him so strongly, and of which his consequent adoption of his sentiments formed a collateral evidence.

It may here be proper to observe, that the translation of Swedenborg's little work on the Intercourse between the Soul and the Body had been published not long previously (in 1770), with a Preface by the translator, addressed to the Universities, urging the author's claims to attention. This Mr. Wesley had probably seen, and had thence conceived the desire he acknowledges to see the author. The discovery that this desire, though it had remained a secret in his own breast, was known to Swedenborg, must have affected him very strongly; it must have convinced him that Swedenborg's assertion, that he possessed the privilege of conversing with angels and spirits, was true: and it is natural to suppose that he would conclude from it, that the cause assigned by Swedenborg of his having received this privilege, namely, that he might be qualified for a holy office to which he had been called, was true also. There is, further, the strongest evidence that Mr. Wesley's conviction went as far as this. I had heard an anecdote demonstrating it related in conversation by the Reverend and venerable Mr. Clowes, Rector of St. John's, Manchester, whose high character for every quality that can adorn a Minister of the Gospel, and of course for veracity among the rest, is acknowledged by all who knew him (and few were known through a wider

circle) — by those who differed from him as well as by those who agreed with him in theological sentiment; I therefore wrote to him to request a written statement of the particulars, with leave to publish it with his name; with which request he kindly complied. The part of his letter (dated January 19, 1826) which relates immediately to this subject, is as follows:

*“My Very Dear Sir,—*In full and free compliance with your wishes, as expressed in your kind favor of the 16th. I send you the following Memoir of the late Mr. Wesley, as communicated to me by my late pious and learned friend, Richard Houghton, Esq., of Liverpool, who was also intimately acquainted with Mr. Wesley, insomuch that the latter gentleman never visited Liverpool without passing some time with Mr. Houghton. As near as I can recollect, it was in the spring of the year 1773 that I received the communication, one morning, when I called on Mr. Houghton at his house, and at a time too, when the writings of the Hon. E. S. began to excite public attention. These writings were at that time unknown to myself, but not so to my friend Mr. Houghton, who was in the habit of correspondence with the Rev. T. Hartley on the subject, and was very eager to make me acquainted with them. Accordingly, in the course of our conversation, my friend took occasion to mention the name of Mr. Wesley, and the manner in which he, on a late visit to Liverpool, had expressed his sentiments on those writings. ‘We may now (said Mr. Wesley) burn all our books of Theology. God has sent us a teacher from heaven, and in the doctrines of Swedenborg we may learn all that it is necessary for us to know.’”

The manner in which Mr. Wesley here expressed himself was strong indeed; so much so, that were it not certain that his mind must have been at that time under a very powerful influence in Swedenborg’s favor, he might be suspected to have spoken ironically. This I observed in my letter to Mr. Clowes; to which he replies, “I can hardly conceive, from the manner in which it was expressed by Mr. Houghton, that irony had any thing to do with it:” and Mr. Houghton must have known with certainty whether it had or not. His repeating Mr. Wesley’s observation to Mr. Clowes, as an inducement to *him* to peruse the writings of Swedenborg, is a complete proof that Mr. H. believed it to mean what it expresses. But an examination of dates will show, that Mr. Wesley’s statement to that gentleman was made while the impression from Swedenborg’s supernatural communication was acting in all its force. Mr. Clowes’ interview with Mr. Houghton was in the spring of 1773. Mr. Wesley does not appear to have been at Liverpool between that time and the 10th of the preceding October, when he re-

turned from his last great circuit. In that circuit he did visit Liverpool, and was there early in April, 1772. This then must be the "late visit" mentioned by Mr. Houghton: *and this was within six weeks after he had received the extraordinary communication from Swedenborg.* This is certain: and it is also highly probable, that, at the time of his visiting Liverpool, the effect of that communication was greatly strengthened, by the verification of the announcement, which, we have seen, Swedenborg had made to him, of the day of his own death. He died, as he had announced, on the 29th of March: there can be little doubt that a notice of it appeared in the papers; it would thence, it is highly probable, be known to Mr. Wesley when he was at Liverpool, about a fortnight afterwards: and the words he then uttered to Mr. Houghton will not appear stronger than he might be expected to use, when two such recent and completely incontrovertible proofs of the truth of Swedenborg's claims were operating on his mind.

Yet Mr. Wesley, thus miraculously convinced of the truth of Swedenborg's claims (as far, at least, as relates to his intercourse with the spiritual world), afterwards exerted himself to check the extension of the same conviction to others! in which, however, he only afforded a proof of Swedenborg's constant assertion, that miraculous evidence is inefficacious for producing any real or permanent change in a man's confirmed religious sentiments. When Mr. Wesley uttered the strong declaration respecting Swedenborg and his writings, he spoke of the latter, rather from what he expected to find them, than from what he actually knew them to be. The probability is, that he at this time knew little more of them than he had learned from the tract "On the Intercourse;" which contains, probably, nothing that he would except against; especially as it is certain, as will be seen presently, that even the treatise on Heaven and Hell, which gives the main results of Swedenborg's spiritual experience, was not condemned by him. But when he came to find that Swedenborg's writings militated against some of the sentiments that he had strongly confirmed in his own mind; these, which were his interior convictions, gradually threw off the exterior conviction arising from merely outward though miraculous evidence; hence he afterwards accepted the false report of Mathesius, and promoted its circulation. Indeed, there can be no doubt that, *then*, such a statement as that of Mathesius would operate as a relief to him; for though he could not receive the whole of Swedenborg's doctrines, the positive proof he possessed of the author's supernatural knowledge must often have disturbed him in his rejection of them: he must therefore have been

glad to meet with any thing which could make him, in regard to that rejection, better satisfied with himself. Finally, perhaps, other causes assisted to strengthen his opposition. When first he published the slanderous report (in 1781), he still seems to have had some misgivings; hence he prefaced it with the acknowledgment, that Swedenborg was "*a very great man,*" and that in his writings "*there are many excellent things:*" when he afterwards seemed less inclined to admit so much, although, no doubt, he still spoke sincerely, a little human frailty perhaps influenced his judgment. It is well known that Mr. W. was always prompt in taking measures to put down any thing like rebellion among his disciples,—any thing that tended to the diminution of his authority over their minds. Now it is a certain fact, that Mr. Smith was not the only one of his pupils who began to think the doctrines of the New Church superior to those of Methodism: among his other preachers who came to the same conclusion, were Mr. James Hindmarsh, Mr. Isaac Hawkins, and Mr. R. Jackson, deceased, with Mr. J. W. Salmon and Mr. T. Parker, still living;* all of whom became active promoters of those doctrines: it therefore is not to be wondered at, if Mr. Wesley at last took the most decisive steps to check their further extension among his flock.

The above appears to me to be a fair and highly probable account of the progress, on this subject, of Mr. Wesley's mind. It is not, however, here offered with the view of casting any imputation on his memory. I have little doubt, that, though some erroneous sentiments confirmed in his understanding prevented him from accepting, in this world, the doctrines of the New Church, his intentions were upright, and there was a principle of real good in his heart, which, in the other life would throw off the errors that obscured it, and enable him to receive the truth. This, it is probable, was seen by Swedenborg, and was the reason of his inviting him to an interview: and thus, I trust, though Mr. Wesley acted chiefly as an opponent to him while on earth, he may now be associated with him in heaven. Let it, also, be remembered, that for the alleged facts published by Mr. Wesley, Mr. Wesley himself is not responsible: he was herein imposed upon by Mathesius. Let not, then, his followers still confirm themselves against Swedenborg's testimony by what Mr. Wesley published against him: let them rather weigh, without Mr. Wesley's prejudices, the reasons he had, and might have had, for coming to a *finally* favorable conclusion: and let them accept the sentiments

* When the first edition of this work was published.

which, we may hope, Mr. Wesley now holds, instead of adhering to those which he, in all probability, has rejected.

Closely connected with the name of Mr. Wesley, is that of Mr. Fletcher; and as considerable pains have been taken to represent this distinguished character as participating in Mr. Wesley's mistaken opinions respecting Swedenborg, it may be satisfactory to some if I here enter into a little digression to correct this misrepresentation, and to establish the assertion advanced above,* that "among the believers of Swedenborg's spiritual intercourse, if not of the whole of his doctrine, is certainly to be reckoned the celebrated and eminently pious Vicar of Madeley, the Rev. Mr. Fletcher:" — consequently, he did not regard what Swedenborg has communicated on that subject as the result of mental derangement. It is also certain that, at one period, Mrs. Fletcher, scarcely less celebrated among the Methodist body than her husband, approved, at least, of much of Swedenborg's writings; clear proof of which will appear in the next SECTION.

In this lady's journal, as edited after her death, by the Rev. H. Moore, there is a passage of a contradictory description. But there really are circumstances which make it difficult to believe, that the paragraph, *as it stands*, ever proceeded from her pen. It professes to relate a conversation between Mr. Fletcher and herself, not minuted down at the time, but inserted under the date of March 5, 1806, *more than twenty years after Mr. Fletcher's decease*. It begins thus: "A thought has struck my mind, That from some things mentioned in the notes subjoined to the Portrait of St. Paul, edited by Mr. Gilpin, after my dear husband's death, he might be thought to favor the opinions of Baron Swedenborg; I therefore think it my duty to bear my witness to the contrary." — What Mr. Gilpin had said on this subject I have not ascertained, not having been able to obtain a sight of the first edition of the work; and the less honest editors of the subsequent editions have so carefully erased it, that not a syllable respecting Swedenborg is in them to be found. Mrs. F. proceeds: "*The first book which he saw contained but little amiss*: and Mr. Wesley having observed concerning it, 'I think it will neither do good nor harm,' — Mr. Fletcher, soon after, writing to his brother, who had mentioned it, observed, that *it was a book which he did not condemn*." — *Now this book, which Mr. Fletcher did not condemn, which Mrs. Fletcher allows to contain but little amiss, and which Mr. Wesley did not think capable of doing any harm, was the Treatise on Heaven and Hell*: and that is a work of no neutral character; for its details being constantly given as the re-

sults of the Author's personal knowledge and experience, not to condemn them is to acknowledge it to be at least highly probable, that he wrote from divine illumination. And that work not only contains the Author's views respecting Heaven, Hell, and the Life after Death in general, but it touches, either directly or incidentally, upon the whole of his doctrines; in particular, it devotes two chapters to the explanation of the correspondence between spiritual things and natural, and advances throughout the great doctrine on which all the others hinge, — that of the Sole Divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ. If, then, Mr. Fletcher did not strongly favor the whole, would he have encouraged his brother, for whose spiritual welfare he felt the most tender solicitude, to study such a work, by telling him, "it was a book which he did not condemn?" — Mrs. F.'s journal adds, "But when he had seen a little more of the Baron's works, he said to me one day, 'Polly, I believe Mr. — will be a Swedenborger, and I am very sorry for it.' I said 'Well, if he can believe there are wax candles and feasts in heaven, he must have strange ideas.' Mr. F. replied, 'My dear, thou dost not perceive the snake in the grass. These books deny the atonement, and so strike at the root of all true religion.' In the same mind he continued to the last." It is here very strange that Mrs. F. should have made the remark about wax candles in heaven; *for no such statement is anywhere made by Swedenborg*. That Swedenborg's works do not deny the atonement as represented in the Scriptures, will be seen in the subsequent Section: and it seems scarcely possible that Mr. F. should have thought so. And that he esteemed Swedenborg's works injurious, and *continued in that mind to the last*, is utterly irreconcilable with the certain fact, that *one of the last acts of his life was, to introduce those works to a beloved friend, who is living at this day, and blesses his memory, for having been brought by him to a knowledge of those invaluable writings*.

The following is from a letter of Mrs. M. Walker, of Bath, to a lady in London, dated May 10, 1820. The original is before me. "I do not remember ever to have read any passage put forth by a public religious character with feelings of more surprise and astonishment, than one lately put into my hand by a friend, who is a lover of truth. The passage alluded to is in Mr. H. Moore's Life of that late very dear and venerable mother in Israel, Mrs. Fletcher, and is relative to Mr. Fletcher's opinion and sentiments on the invaluable writings of Emanuel Swedenborg; *for which*, I have from *undoubted* and *united* testimonies been convinced, that *both Mr. and Mrs. F. entertained much respect*, if they did not fully ap-

preciate their worth. When young, I was honored by *intimate acquaintance* with both those distinguished and pious characters; and I for some years corresponded with the above lady, both as Miss Bosanquet and Mrs. Fletcher. The last time I had the pleasure of addressing her, my letter was conveyed to her hands by W. Gilbert, Esq., a native of Antigua; in which I informed her that I had embraced the doctrines of the New Jerusalem Church, requesting her sentiments thereon. On this gentleman's return, to Bristol, I naturally and ardently expected her reply: but to my great disappointment Mr. G. informed me, that Mrs. F. had requested her kind love, and hoped I would excuse her not writing, as the weak state of her eyes prohibited her doing it. I then inquired if she had made no remark relative to E. S. Mr. G. replied, that she had conversed freely with him on that subject, and said, that she could always see a great difference in his writings according to the station he described himself as standing in, or receiving his instructions from: — for instance, when he wrote from the *east*, she could perceive more of the spirit of the Lord to be in it than when from any other quarter, when she considered what he wrote as coming from some spirit or angel, and sometimes from himself.* I remember that this gentleman specified some parts of his writings, but cannot recollect which, as a proof of her assertion, mentioned as such by herself. Now as this dear lady always, from my earliest years, expressed a strong affection for me, and, had my father been willing, would have taken me home as her own daughter (being then in Bath, I think about the year 1766 or 67), it is most probable that a woman of her sweet heavenly spirit would have warned me against read-

* It is to be observed, that Swedenborg never describes himself as standing in, or receiving what he wrote from, different quarters: this then is only Mrs. Fletcher's mode of describing the difference she thought she perceived in his writings: but she herein adopts as true what he states respecting the difference of the quarters in the spiritual world, and the arrangement of its inhabitants therein according to their states; according to which representation, the east is where the Lord himself appears, and those are stationed towards the east who are eminently principled in love to him. But Mrs. F. here fully acknowledges her belief, that Swedenborg really did receive communications from the spiritual world, and frequently, even from the Lord, though she falls into the inconsistency of supposing, that he who was thus the channel of divine and heavenly communications, was equally the channel of very inferior influences, and was himself unable to distinguish the one from the other! The fact is, she saw that the reality of his spiritual intercourse could not be denied, nor the exalted excellence of many of his views; but cherishing, herself, some erroneous sentiments, she made these the standard of her judgment, and so ascribed to an imperfect source whatever in his writings was inconsistent with her own opinions.

ing or receiving doctrines which she considered *dangerous*, had she seen them *in such light*: which she might have done verbally, if unable to write, by Mr. Gilbert. — Again: I do not recollect the year, but at the time the Rev. Melville Horne went to Sierra Leone, leaving Mrs. Horne behind on account of her advanced state of pregnancy, Mrs. H. spent about ten days with me; and I experienced great delight in her conversation and communications of spiritual sentiments, not without surprise at finding them so congenial with my own. One day, on her making some spiritual remark which I knew did not grow in the old church, I said, ‘My dear Mrs. Horne, you can say, Shibboleth! — where did you gather your last sentiment from?’ ‘From Madeley,’ she replied, ‘from dear Mr. Salmon.’ I then inquired if she had ever conversed with Mr. Fletcher on those doctrines: to which she replied in the affirmative, and that he appeared to esteem them so highly, that she inquired why he did not preach them in his church. His reply she gave me in the following remarkable words: ‘*Because my congregation is not in fit states to receive them.*’ ”

Mrs. Walker then relates what she had heard respecting Mr. Fletcher from J. W. Salmon, Esq. of Namptwich; but having myself been favored with a letter from that gentleman detailing the particulars more fully, with leave to publish them, I give them on his immediate authority. His letter to me is dated July 2, 1825: and in it he says as follows:

“In answer to your inquiry, I state the following particulars for certain, which took place betwixt Mr. Fletcher and myself, the last time I had the pleasure of passing a couple of days with him at Madeley, which was but a few months before his death. After receiving me with open arms into his house, he thus addressed me: ‘My dear brother, (which he always called me), I am glad to see you, and hope we are once more met to enjoy a heavenly feast together.’ After this he went into his study, and brought the Baron’s treatise on Heaven and Hell, and laid it on the table before me, saying, ‘There, my dear brother, is a book, the contents of which will just suit your taste; and as I am particularly engaged for two or three hours every day about this time, in finishing a controversial work of some importance, you will excuse my leaving you so hastily, and amuse yourself with reading a little in the book I have brought you, which I believe will be agreeable to your present state of mind.’ He then left me: and being greatly impressed with the manner of his introducing the book to me, I fell on my knees, and devoutly prayed, that if the truths contained in the book before me were likely to make me more holy and heavenly-minded, I might be prepared to receive them, and live accord-

ingly. Then rising from my knees, I opened the book and, passing over the preface, I read about 30 pages, and was deeply impressed with the whole of them, but more than words can express with the declaration, that the Lord Jesus is the only God of heaven and earth, and the only Object of true Christian worship. Just after being thus divinely impressed, Mr. Fletcher came into the room, and thus addressed me: 'Let me now ask you, my dear brother, how you like the Baron?' To which I replied, 'Who can do otherwise than like him? I never met with such a book in my life. He discards a trinity of persons in the God-head and makes the Lord himself to be the only God of heaven and earth. I should be glad to peruse the whole book if you can conveniently lend it me.' To which he replied, 'I will lend it you with great pleasure, and desire you will make any marginal notes on it you think proper.' He further said, that *he regarded the Baron's writings as a magnificent feast, set out with many dainties, but that he had not an appetite for every dish.* He not only declared this to me, but I have frequently been informed he said the same to others. What books of Swedenborg's he was acquainted with besides the treatise on Heaven and Hell, I cannot say; but I should think he was well acquainted with the contents of that; as he told me that he intended to write a treatise on the science of correspondences; and from that book, I have often thought, he gained the knowledge of that long lost and most important science." — Here then we see whence he acquired that extraordinary talent for opening the spiritual sense of the Scriptures, by which Mr. Gilpin assures us, he was so distinguished. — Mr. Salmon then mentions how he was struck by Mr. F.'s manner of praying. He always began with "Dear Lord Jesus;" from which, and from a passage in his Pastoral Letters, p. 103, Mr. S. concludes, 'that our Incarnate God and Saviour was the grand Object of Mr. Fletcher's faith and worship.' Mr. S. adds, "Let me not forget to acknowledge, that Mrs. Fletcher sent to me for the book, saying, that as her dear husband was gone into the other world, she wished to see the account of that world given by the Baron. — What her sentiments were respecting the Baron's writings, I cannot say, as she never was present in the few conversations I had (respecting them) with her husband."

The fact then must surely now be admitted to be amply established, — that Mr. Fletcher is to be reckoned among the believers of Swedenborg's spiritual intercourse, if not of the whole of his doctrine; and, however the strange passage came into her journal, the same fact appears to be true in respect to Mrs. Fletcher also, though, probably, to a less extent. Would

such a man as Mr. Fletcher have introduced writings to his friend, with the anticipation that that friend would approve them, if himself thought them the offspring of delusion? Would he have permitted his friend to express his high approbation of the leading doctrine of those writings without checking his ardor, if himself deemed that doctrine untrue? The thing is impossible: and the similar reflection which Mrs. Walker makes respecting Mrs. Fletcher's conduct to her, is equally well-founded. To Mr. F.'s remark, "that he regarded Swedenborg's writings as a magnificent feast, set out with many dainties, but that he had not an appetite for every dish," the same observation is applicable as to Mrs. Fletcher's notion, that our Author wrote at times from the Spirit of the Lord, and at other times from inferior spirits or from himself: only Mr. F. does not ascribe what he less approved to any fault in the things themselves, — for he compares the whole of those writings to a feast, and all their contents to dainties, — but to the state of his own appetite: modified, as this necessarily was, by the views of doctrine which he had imbibed in early life, and through the fallacy of some of which he was only beginning to penetrate when he was taken away.

But to return from this digression.

III. We have seen that the only specific ground upon which it has ever been attempted to found the imputation against Swedenborg of insanity, proves in every respect to be a foundation of sand: but as the charge continues to be vaguely reiterated by multitudes, they know not why, we will add some considerations upon it in general, taken from a correspondence in which I was formerly engaged. My opponent, on that occasion, was a young gentleman of very respectable attainments belonging to the medical profession; who, while repeating the old calumny, made more show of supporting it by argument than has been usual with our assailants. I was thus led to go more particularly into the examination of the imputation than had, I believe, been done before. The controversy embraced other subjects; but I shall only extract the part that relates to the present question. I will give as much of my adversary's letters, as, with my answers, is necessary to place the case fairly before the reader.

His first letter, being an attack on a lecture delivered by me, appeared in "the Colchester Gazette" of December 28, 1822. In this, my opponent, who writes under the signature of *Guilielmus*, had merely thrown out the charge in a declamatory manner; which I notice, in the following extract from my answer, inserted in the same paper, January 4, 1823. "You charge the truly illustrious Swedenborg with insanity; only sup-

porting the charge with the gratuitous assertion, that 'it is a fact well known to those versed in his biography:' and you ask, 'Who would deem it wise to stake his faith, his hope, his terrestrial happiness and eternal felicity, upon the wild, and visionary, and mystical and baleful, — if bright, and beauteous, and ingenious reveries of *a Madman?*' Allow me, Sir, to say, that I presume that I am, at least, as well 'versed in his biography,' as you can be: and I know, what perhaps you do not, that he has found two classes of biographers; one, who, *without any personal acquaintance with him, or intimate knowledge of his works*, have, from mere *hearsay*, the *idle fictions* of enemies, represented him as you describe; while the other class, who were *personally acquainted with him, and who had fairly examined his writings*, agree in representing him as retaining '*a sound mind, memory, and understanding, to the last hour of his life:*' as was deposed on oath by Mr. and Mrs. Shearsmith, at whose house he had repeatedly lodged, and in which he died, in an affidavit sworn before the Lord Mayor, Nov. 24, 1785 [to rebut the charge of his having, when dying, retracted his former sentiments]. I might here quote the highly honorable testimony on this subject borne by the Rev. T. Hartley, M. A. Rector of Winwick in Northamptonshire, who was intimately acquainted with Swedenborg for several years before his death; — of Mr. Springer, formerly Swedish Consul at the port of London; of Dr. Beyer, Member of the Ecclesiastical Consistory at Gottenburg; of Dr. Messiter, an eminent English physician; of Mr. Robsam, Director of the Bank of Stockholm; and of Count Hôpken, many years Prime Minister of Sweden, and one of the most illustrious statesmen that Sweden ever produced. All these were Swedenborg's intimate acquaintances, besides being persons, as their rank and stations demonstrate, well qualified to form a judgment, and well entitled to be believed; how ought then all the hearsay reports, — the idle fictions of prejudice or of ignorance, — to fade away before testimony so unimpeachable!

"But, Sir, we care not for extraneous evidence. It is satisfactory, indeed, that we can produce incomparably more in his favor, even of this kind, than can be produced against him; but we are content to rest the cause, ultimately, upon the evidence which his writings bear to themselves. 'By their fruits ye shall know them,' saith Infallible Wisdom; 'do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?' Can he then be a madman, in whose writings we find the most coherent system of theology, the most satisfactory proof of all the great doctrines of Christianity, the most conclusive evidence of the divinity of the Holy Word, that modern ages have beheld; and all this de-

duced in the most orderly method, with the most logical arrangement of the branches of his argument, the most perfect consistency of system and of sentiment, though conveyed in volumes written (some of them) at the distance of more than twenty years from each other?"

In reply, Gulielmus addressed to me a second letter, which appeared in the same paper, Jan. 25th. The following sentences contain all the strength of his arguments. "You cite the affidavits of several persons who deposed as to the Baron's sanity; and you quote the opinions of others to the same effect. But, Sir, admitting these affidavits to have been conscientiously made, and these opinions impartially given: still, I submit, they cannot prove, beyond all doubt and controversy, the sanity of the Baron. I do not seek to impeach their veracity; but, in a case of this nature, I may be allowed to question their competency to decide. Does not every day show us instances, in which the rich, the noble, the powerful, the talented, and the educated, have given testimony, which subsequent events have proved erroneous? I cannot fail to notice, Sir, you carefully conceal the countless many who have borne different evidence; but you most conveniently content yourself with the gratuitous assertion, 'that it is satisfactory, indeed, that we can produce more in his (the Baron's) favor, even of this kind (viz. extraneous evidence) than can be produced against him.' Sir, I recognize the possibility, that a man may be 'a Swedish Consul at the port of London:' or a 'Member of the Ecclesiastical Consistory at Gottenburg; or 'a Director of the Bank of Stockholm;' or 'an eminent English Physician;' or 'a Count, and many years Prime Minister of Sweden:' or even an enlightened visionary Divine; and yet not competent to decide, unerringly, upon alienation of mind, or that peculiar species of it, with which the Baron was affected, denominated idolomania, in which the lunatic fancies he sees and holds converse with imaginary beings. Sir, the merest tyro in medical knowledge would have informed you, that in cases of insanity like the Baron's, a man will often appear perfectly sane, and will stand the test of the most scrutinizing examination, till the subject is touched upon in which all his fond and delusive systems are concentrated; and then his aberration of mind bursts forth terrifically. I remember a case recorded of a gentleman whom his friends deemed insane: he was examined by several physicians of the greatest celebrity, experience, and talent, without their being able to find the smallest trace of insanity: Dr. Haslam, however, was consulted, who, after a long and ingenious investigation, touched the chord which vibrated to his infatuated fancy. See the opinions* of Mead, Cullen, Ferrisa, Haslam,

* Not respecting Swedenborg.

Monro, Esquirol, Willes, Burrows, and Pritchard. Sir, are we to be told that the depositions of two persons, and the opinions of a few more, are to be deemed infallible, upon a subject in which the most experienced talent is liable to be mistaken? Let no individual, Sir, form his opinion of the Baron from our newspaper-report on the subject; — no, out of his own mouth let the Baron be justified or condemned. Can he be a sane man who records the subsequent reverie as matter of fact? The Baron informs us, ‘that on a certain night a man appeared to him in the midst of a strong shining light, and said, I am God the Lord, the Creator and Redeemer; I have chosen thee to explain to men the interior and spiritual sense of the sacred writings: I will dictate to thee what thou oughtest to write?’ From this period, the Baron relates, he was so illumined, as to behold, in the clearest manner, what passed in the spiritual world, and that he could converse with angels and spirits as with men, &c. I ask, does the Baron deserve any more credit than we give to the pretended visions of Mahomet, whom most denominate, by way of illustrious infamy, the False Prophet; or than the asserted inspiration of one Lodowick Muggleton, who, with his companion Reeve, set up for great prophets about the year 1657, and promulgated that their mission was entirely spiritual, &c. — Seriously, Sir, there seems to have been method in the Baron’s madness, which enabled him so exactly to tread in the steps of Muggleton and Reeve, not abating an atom of their fanaticism and delusion. — Sir, in another part of your reply, with the ingenuity of sophistry, you imposingly ask, ‘Can he be a madman in whose writing we find the most coherent system of theology,’ &c. — Sir, I am willing to leave the decision of this point to the efficient decision of every unsophisticated and enlightened enquirer after divine truth, when he has perused the Baron’s works; yes, let the subject be decided ‘by the evidence which his writings bear to themselves.’ —

“I conclude, Sir, by thanking you for the effort you have made to instruct me in the mysteries of the Baron’s reveries: but I am so well satisfied with the good old way, that I am by no means desirous of an accession of any extraordinary new light.” —

This second letter of Gulielmus drew a second from me, which the Editor of the Colchester Gazette inserted in his papers of Feb. 22, and March 1, 8, and 29. I extract the following paragraphs, here and there slightly altered:

“I must first observe, that you have here only given an additional illustration of the fact, which we must know little of human nature in its present state of degeneracy not to expect, that such truly profound views of divine things as are developed

by Swedenborg, and the means by which he obtained them, must needs 'seem incongruous,' as one of your authorities, [Dr. Gray, quoted by Gulielmus on the subject of the patriarchal history] well expresses it, 'to those who cannot raise their minds to a contemplation of any economy which they have not experienced, and who proudly question every event not consistent with their notions of propriety.' This, Sir, is the sole ground of the assertion that Swedenborg was a madman.' —

"Allow me to state the general facts, with your conclusion from them.

"Scripture has abundantly predicted, that a great change in the state of the church, would, at some future period, take place; All history testifies, that whenever such changes have taken place in former ages, they have always been attended, sooner or later, with great alterations in the political aspect of the world. The alterations of this kind which the last fifty years have produced, are such as the world has not seen since those which attended the first establishment of Christianity: Swedenborg, more than fifty years ago, announced the arrival of the time for the fulfillment of the Scripture-prophecies alluded to: 'Flesh and blood could not have revealed this' to him, but only our Father which is in heaven: But, say you, for him to affirm this is an unquestionable proof of insanity; though the truth of his testimony receives corroboration from the events of every passing year, yet because he asserts that he obtained his knowledge in the only way in which it was possible to attain it, he was a Madman. Such, Sir, when put in a tangible form, is the chain of reasoning which terminates in what you denominate your incontrovertible statement. Happily, however, we have a statement far more incontrovertible, even that of God Himself; which is, 'Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secrets unto his servants the prophets: '* and never yet did he suffer the period to arrive for the execution of any of his magnificent works of mercy and judgment, without enlightening some faithful servant to communicate the important tidings. This, as you allow the truth of Scripture-history, you cannot deny; so that the plain jet of your argument, taking this into the premises, is simply this: — Scripture demonstrates, that to invest men, on the requisite occasion, with divine commissions, has always formed a part of the divine economy as exercised towards man: Numerous false pretenders to such communications appeared in former ages, without the circumstance being considered as derogating from the authority of the true ones: But there have also been false pretenders in modern times: *Therefore*, it is impossible there can again be any true

* Amos iii. 7.

ones. A most legitimate conclusion ! Do you seriously mean to affirm, that although God, in former times, confessedly interposed occasionally in an extraordinary way for the benefit of his church, he either cannot, or will not, do so any more ? Reflect how awful is the state to which you represent the church as having arrived, when its members deny either the power, or the right, or the willingness, of God to interfere, when necessary, for her guidance ! Remember, that when once a wall of separation is built up between heaven and the world, and God is shut out from his church, a door is opened for the admission, from the opposite quarter, of every corruption, both of doctrine and practice. We can, then, no longer wonder at anything that ‘the ancients of the house of Israel do *in the dark*, every man in the chambers of his imagery : *for they say, The Lord seeth us not ; the Lord hath forsaken the earth.*’*

“ You draw your arguments in support of your charge from three sources : from *Testimony* ; from the *Principles of Medical Jurisprudence* ; and from *Theological Considerations*.

“ On the question of *Testimony* ; In reference to the deposition of the Shearsmiths, and the opinions of the learned and noble persons mentioned by me, you say, ‘ Admitting these affidavits to have been conscientiously made, and these opinions impartially given, still I submit they cannot prove beyond all doubt and controversy the sanity of the Baron.’ Sir, I brought them forward, not as absolutely decisive proof, but as strong presumptive evidence ; as affording a more than adequate set-off against the calumnies of the ‘countless many,’ who, you assure us, have borne different evidence.’ Who these ‘countless many’ are, you, Sir, wisely as well as carefully, conceal : wherefore I will tell our readers. They consist of such persons as Gulielmus, who, without knowing anything of the matter themselves, are ever ready to echo a scandalous tale that they have heard from others, and who, when it has been thus circulated through a nation, cry out, ‘ See ! they who repeat it are a *countless many* ; and what every body says must be true.’ But, Sir, you must know little of the rules of evidence, which are those of common sense, if you are not aware, that a report does not gain, from the multitude who retail it at second hand, one jot of additional credibility ; for this, it depends entirely upon the number, character, and means of knowledge, of those with whom it originated : on which account, I did not refer you to the thousands who have received Swedenborg’s testimony as witnesses in his favor, but only to such as found their evidence on their personal acquaintance with him ; and I could easily add to their number. But the stories respecting his sup-

* Ez. viii. 12.

posed insanity cannot be traced up to one witness of this description. They were first put in circulation by Mr. Mathesius, Minister of the Swedish Chapel in London, who was a bitter opponent of Swedenborg's sentiments; and who professed to relate his tale upon the authority of a Mr. Brockmer, at whose house in London Swedenborg had once lodged, but who, when questioned upon the subject by some gentlemen who waited on him for the purpose, *denied having given Mr. Mathesius any such information.* — Such, Sir is the

—— *tenuis sine viribus umbra*

to which you and your 'countless many' had given the

—— *clypeumque jumbamque,*
Divini capitis; —

and thus, when pursued by a candid inquirer,

—— *nubi se immiscuit atræ.*

To cast up accounts, then, as we go on, how stands your argument as founded on witnesses? Just thus. A number of gentlemen of the highest respectability, together with the persons in whose house he lived, all of whom had the fullest opportunities of observing his conduct, have borne testimony on the question of Swedenborg's sanity: the testimony of such witnesses, by all the rules of evidence, is entitled to credit: But their testimony is in his favor: *Therefore* he must have been insane. Again: 'A countless many,' who refer as the source of their information, to a man who denies having given them any, have borne testimony on the question of Swedenborg's sanity: The testimony of such witnesses, by all the rules of evidence, is unworthy of credit: But their testimony is against him: *Therefore* he could not have been sane. — O Prejudice, Prejudice! how great is thy power over those 'who cannot raise their minds to the contemplation of any economy which they have not experienced!' How readily at the touch of thy magic wand, is white transformed into black, and black into white! What thou deniest, no testimony can render credible! What thou affirmest, must, in spite of all testimony, be deemed incontrovertible! Thou canst make men believe, that the more positive the testimony in Swedenborg's favor, the less likely it is to be true, and that when deposed on oath, it becomes utterly incredible.

"I proceed to examine your arguments drawn from the *Principles of Medical Jurisprudence*. For feeling that the persons named by me are irrefragable witnesses on every subject of which they could have a competent knowledge, you would fain represent this as a case in which they are not quali-

fied to form an opinion: so, rejecting the verdict of general reason, thus expressed by men collected promiscuously from the upper ranks of society and the learned professions, you claim this cause for the decision of medical men alone. Nor, it seems, are even these, if taken generally, to be depended upon for such a purpose: for though 'the merest tyro in medical philosophy' has 'in cases of insanity,' a wonderful superiority over all *un-medical* intellect, yet here, you affirm, even physicians of the greatest celebrity, experience, and talent, 'are liable to be mistaken.' Great caution, then, you deem, must be used, in framing a jury likely to return you a verdict, even of medical men, alone. In this opinion of yours I entirely concur; since, strange as it may appear to you, not only was ~~one~~ of the gentlemen I mentioned before a physician, but it is a fact, that the number of medical men who have embraced the doctrines of Swedenborg, with full assurance that they are not the dictates of 'a madman,' is, in proportion to the whole number of his followers, fully as great as in any other religious profession whatever: indeed, I am satisfied, much greater. Swedenborg, also, has a claim to the candid regard of medical men, as the author of two works, entitled *Regnum Animale* and *Œconomia Regni Animalis*, which display the most profound acquaintance with anatomical and physiological science: And, what is sufficiently remarkable, one of these works, or at least a great portion of it, was written after the access of his imputed derangement.*

"But, Sir, I have two other remarks to make on what you have said respecting the application of medical science to the question before us, The *first* is, That, at the utmost, you have only shown an appeal to medical science to be here out of place. For you represent the chief use of this to be, in detecting the latent hallucination, where the patient, as often happens endeavors to conceal it. But the peculiar persuasion entertained by Swedenborg, he never concealed: nor did the gentlemen who have deposed to the soundness of his mind, do so in ignorance of this persuasion, but with a full knowledge of it, and after having weighed it and the whole of his character, conduct, and writings, together. The question which thus arises is not one in the science of medicine, but in theology; and the possession of medical knowledge confers no capacity of deciding it, beyond what is possessed by every man of general information and good sense. My *second* remark is, That, upon your own showing, an appeal to medical science must terminate in Swedenborg's favor. That you belong to the pro-

* It was published in three parts, two of which were printed in 1744, and the third in 1745: his spiritual intercourse began in 1748.

fession yourself, is sufficiently obvious; and I see no reason to doubt your claim to a respectable share of professional knowledge: of course, I cannot question the accuracy of your description of those 'cases of insanity,' which you affirm to be 'like the Baron's.' In these, you say, 'a man will often appear perfectly sane, and will stand the test of the most scrutinizing examination, till the subject is touched upon, in which all his fond and delusive systems are concentrated; and then his aberration of mind bursts forth terrifically.' Now, Sir, no part of this description at all applies to Swedenborg: for, in the first place, though he did not obtrude his peculiar notion, it never required any 'scrutinizing examination' to draw them from him; nor, secondly, where the subject was touched upon, nor even when he was rudely opposed, did he ever exhibit those *terrific bursts*, which you represent as the decisive symptom. Near the beginning of the first of his publications on theology, and repeatedly afterwards, he states his anticipation of such imputations, and his indifference to them: and he always evinced in conversation, the same self-possession. He never would enter into dispute on points of religion. When obliged to defend himself, he did it mildly, and in few words: if they wished to urge him further, he retired from all contest, only saying, 'Read my writings with attention and without prejudice: they shall answer for me: and perhaps you will see reason to change your sentiments.'* This behavior, Sir, when 'the subject was touched in which his *not* delusive system was concentrated,' is very different from the *terrific bursts* to which you allow the lunatic will, on such occasions, give vent. Judged, therefore, even by your own theory, Swedenborg must be acquitted.

"Finding, then, Sir, that the Principles of Medical Jurisprudence will not serve, any more than the rules of Evidence, to condemn our author, you at last betake yourself to *Theological Considerations*; from whence you lay down a canon, which, if admitted, will certainly consign him to the condemned cell; and much good company with him. The Apostolic canon in such cases is, 'Believe not *every* spirit, but *try the spirits whether they be of God*;'† and the touchstone to which they are to be brought is pointed out by the prophet: 'To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no truth in them:‡' But instead of this canon, you offer another, which, requiring no discrimination in its exercise, is well suited for those who would decide in a summary way, without the trouble of examining the merits of the case. It is simply this: *Whoever professes to be the bearer*

* Anecdotes collected by Pernetti.

† 1 John iv. 1.

‡ Isa. viii. 20.

of divine communications, is insane. To bring Swedenborg within the operation of this rule, you quote, *as if from his own works*, a passage which is *nowhere to be found in them*, but which you seem to have taken from some Biographical Dictionary or Cylcopædia, few of which give anything like a fair account of the matter. A statement, in substance resembling yours, has indeed been given by one of his friends: but there is very great reason to doubt its accuracy; and the particulars, as quoted by you, cannot, certainly, be depended on as correct. I prefer then to abide by Swedenborg's own account; and the most particular relation which he has given of himself is in his work entitled *True Christian Religion*: the last chapter of which treats 'Of the consummation of the age (called in the common Translation *the end of the world*); of the coming of the Lord; and of the New Heaven and New Church.' One of the sections of this chapter is headed, 'That the coming of the Lord is not a coming to destroy the visible heaven and habitable earth, and to create a new heaven and a new earth, as many have heretofore supposed, in consequence of not understanding the spiritual sense of the Word:' and another Section is designed to show, 'That the Second Coming of the Lord is not a Coming in Person, but in the Word, which is from Him, and is (in its essence) Himself.' After having demonstrated these propositions with great clearness of reasoning and powerful Scripture testimony, he proceeds to another which is required to make the series complete; which is, 'That this Second Coming of the Lord is effected by the instrumentality of man, to whom He has manifested Himself in Person, and whom He has filled with His Spirit, to teach from Him, by the Word, the Doctrines of the New Church.' This last proposition he begins to illustrate thus: 'Since the Lord cannot manifest Himself in Person to the world, as is shown in the preceding Section; and yet he hath foretold that he will come again, and found a New Church, which is the New Jerusalem; it follows, that he will effect this by the instrumentality of a man, who shall not only receive the doctrines of this Church in his understanding, but also publish them by means of the press. That the Lord hath manifested himself to me his servant, and appointed me to this office, and that he afterwards opened the eyes of my spirit, and so introduced me into the spiritual world, and granted me the view of heaven and hell, and the privilege of conversing with angels and spirits, which I have now enjoyed for many years, *I testify in truth*: as also, that from the first day of my calling, I have never taken any thing that respects the doctrines of the church from any angel, but from the Lord alone, while reading the Word.' Here, Sir, if a wonderful fact is re-

lated, it is no more than is worthy of the occasion assigned for it, and this occasion is one, which, every reader must acknowledge, *must arise at some time or other*; as also, that when it does arise, *it must demand such an instrument for its announcement, as our author, in so unaffected a manner, states himself to have been made.*

But, it seems, come when it may, you are predetermined not to believe it, but to denounce whoever shall declare it as a madman: for you ask, in a manner that conveys the strongest negative answer, 'Can he be a sane man who records such a reverie as a matter of fact?' But, Sir, did you consider whom you will include among the insane, if you make this the criterion? Did you never read of one who says, in words very like your version of the Baron's reverie, 'It came to pass, that, as I took my journey, and was come nigh unto Damascus, about noon, suddenly there shone from heaven a great light round about me: and I fell on the ground, and heard a voice saying unto me, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And I answered, Who art thou, Lord? And He said unto me, I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest.* Do you not recollect also, that the same person says of the gospel which he taught, 'I received it not of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ?† Have you also forgotten who affirms that he was 'caught up to the third heaven,' and likewise, that 'he was caught up into paradise, and heard there unspeakable words, which it is not possible for men to utter;' and who also speaks of 'the abundance of his revelations?‡ These are *reveries* very like the Baron's: 'Can then he be a sane man who records them?' Or did you never hear of another, who says, 'I was in the spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice as of a trumpet, saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last,' and who, when he 'turned to see the voice that spake with him, saw one like unto the Son of Man,§ whose glorious appearance he particularly describes; and who has written a whole book, full of the extraordinary things which he saw and heard, when he was 'in the spirit,' and in 'vision'? Here are *reveries* far more extraordinary still; can then he be a sane man who records them? In short, to adduce all the instances of such *reveries* which we find in the Scriptures, would be to quote half the Bible: and if we judge of this Divine Code by your infallible test, we must pronounce the whole to be the effusions of insanity. You are displeased with me for having stated, in my former letter, that by setting revelation at variance with reason and philosophy [by insisting upon a merely literal interpretation of Scripture], you were strengthening the cause of the infidel: but assuredly you are

* Acts xxii. 6, 7, 8. † Gal. i. 12. ‡ 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4, 7. § Rev. i. 10—13.

doing the same thing here. The infidel assumes as a maxim, that the notion of God's interfering to communicate revelations of his will to man, is utterly incredible : and he may now quote your authority for his general principle. The infidel argues in support of his maxim, that such interference is contrary to common experience, and that they who have pretended to it in modern times are allowed to have been lunatics or impostors : and you re-echo the sentiment. But the infidel, in offering this argument, though weak, is consistent. He will readily acknowledge, that, if it can be proved that such interferences have ever taken place, there is no improbability in supposing that they may take place again. But you, while you adopt his general principle and argument, depart from the consistency which alone makes them worth a moment's consideration : you allow that God has in former times made men the bearers of divine communications, but affirm that whoever professes to stand in this character now, is convicted, *ipso facto*, of insanity. Really, Sir, (and I speak it with concern), this assertion of yours, together with your declared determination to abide, wherever it may lead you, in what you mistakenly call 'the good old way,' makes me fear, that had you lived in Judea when the Saviour of the world appeared in the flesh, you would have remained in the 'good old way' of the Jews, and would have followed the cry which said, 'He hath a devil, and is MAD ; why hear ye him ?'

"You, however, call to your aid Mahomet, the old false prophet, and the more recent ones, Reeve and Muggleton ; who supply you with the following pointed argument : Mahomet was a false prophet : so were Reeve and Muggleton : *therefore*, Swedenborg was another. But, Sir, in order to make us see the force of your *therefore*, you ought to have shown in what respects Swedenborg resembled your false prophets. You certainly have done this in one point : but the point you have selected, being the only one you could find in which Swedenborg resembled Mahomet and the others, is *that single point, in which Mahomet and the others resembled the true prophets* ; which was, in professing to be invested with a divine commission. To complete then your argument, we must introduce your infallible test as the major proposition ; and then we shall find it sufficiently comprehensive if not particularly conclusive. It will stand thus : Every one who professes to have received a divine commission, is insane : Mahomet, Muggleton, all the Apostles and prophets, with Swedenborg, did this : Therefore Mahomet, Muggleton, all the Apostles and prophets, and Swedenborg, were insane.

"But, Sir, you should have known, that neither Mahomet nor Muggleton have been ranked as false prophets simply because they pretended to divine revelations, but because their pretend-

ed revelations contained nothing worthy of the source to which they ascribed them. That Mahomet's system is in many respects diametrically opposite to Holy Writ, is well known. Nor will the parallel you would institute between Swedenborg and Reeve and Muggleton hold any otherwise than in the way of contrast. More disgusting stuff cannot be conceived than fills the pages of those ignorant drivellers: yet, though nothing bordering on such rubbish is to be found in the writings of Swedenborg, you are not ashamed to represent him, and this, you affirm, seriously, as treading exactly in the steps of Reeve and Muggleton, not abating an atom of their fanaticism and delusion? And yet you profess yourself ready to abide by my appeal to his works! Read them first, Sir, and learn what they are. At least, read some one of them straight through, giving a candid attention to every part of its contents: not looking only for such things as may be distorted into subjects of ridicule, as infidels have treated the Bible.

"I will only mention one other circumstance, which marks a very wide distinction indeed between Swedenborg and the whole tribe of such pretenders as you have mentioned. It is a common infirmity with them all, to entertain high conceptions of themselves. Every remarkable one among them has been fond, with Simon the sorcerer, of 'giving out that himself was some great one.'* The magnificent claims of Mahomet are sufficiently known. Reeve and Muggleton affirmed that they were the two witnesses mentioned in Rev. xi. Richard Brothers pretended to be the Prince of the Hebrews. Joanna Southcott fancied herself to be the woman clothed with the sun, mentioned in Rev. xii. ; as Madame Bourignon and Mrs. Buchan, though without her grossness, had done before her. And they have all been forward in promising great blessings to their disciples, simply as such, to commence even in this life; while they breathed great bitterness against their opponents. But in Swedenborg nothing of this is to be found. His views of Scripture were too elevated to allow him to believe that any of its predictions pointed to himself, or to any other individual of the human race. His writings are so free from the least tincture of egotism, that he even never speaks in the first person where it is possible to avoid it. Whenever the subject that he is upon requires him to mention his commission, as in the extract given above, he does it with the most unassuming modesty, taking not the least merit to himself on account of it, but representing it as arising out of the order constantly observed in the Lord's dealings with man, in which he always makes use of human instruments. — In short, neither in his life nor writings can there be traced the least desire to be thought some great one, or any

* Acts viii. 9.

other motive savoring of human infirmity. This fact, alone, is sufficient to render untenable the charge against him of insanity: for where this exists, as you well know, the checks suggested by reason being removed, the corrupt passions that lurk in the human heart always exhibit more or less of their naked deformity. No, Sir, Piety to God and charity to man, form the soul, both of Swedenborg's system and of his conduct; and neither can deserve the reproach you have cast upon them, till it shall be allowable to deem virtue a farce; disinterestedness, madness; a belief in the spiritual and immortal nature of the human soul, and in the existence of an eternal world, its proper home, as rank insanity; a heartfelt conviction of the being of a God, of his omnipresence and perpetual providence, as the climax of absurdity: and till it shall be justifiable to treat the demonstration by argument of the nature of these soul-ennobling excellencies, and of the reality of these great truths, as the most deplorable perversion of the human understanding.

"I will conclude, Sir, with begging of you either to refute the following dilemma, or, accepting which of its conclusions you please, to allow it to govern your next letter. *Either the fact of professing to be the subject of divine communications is alone a sufficient proof of insanity; or it is not: If it is, then Paul and all the other apostles and prophets were insane: If it is not, then the nature of the communications must determine whether the person who pretends to them is insane or not.* — Assuredly, we cannot with any appearance of reason say, in such a case as this, 'The man is mad; therefore his doctrines must be erroneous;' but, after having proved the doctrines to be erroneous, we may say, 'Erroneous doctrines cannot be from God; therefore the man must be mad. The one question ought to be entirely laid aside, till we have determined the other. To raise the cry of insanity in the first instance, is only to appeal to passion and prejudice, instead of reason and truth. I fear that this has been done in the case of Swedenborg, because it was felt to be more easy, by this stigma, to prevent mankind from examining his system, than, when, examined, to prevent it from being embraced by the candid and well-disposed. But I by no means intend to apply this remark to you. I trust that your hostility has proceeded solely from misinformation; and thus that you are included within that canon of Divine Mercy,' Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' "

I earnestly recommend the above discussion of the charge against Swedenborg of insanity, to the serious consideration of my present readers. My Colchester antagonist did not reply again. His arguments are precisely the same as we commonly hear. I never met with better, and I cannot see how better

can be invented. If then these are seen, as they surely must be seen, though ingeniously proposed by Gulielmus, to be utterly futile, let the reproach of "madman," in application to Swedenborg, be abandoned for ever. Only let it be allowed, as must be allowed, that the mere professing to have received divine communications does not prove a man mad; and let the consistency of Swedenborg's conduct and writings with the character he assumes, be tried by the Word of God and by sound reason; and he must receive, we are satisfied, the most honorable verdict.

IV. Before concluding this Section, I will notice two minor objections, strenuously insisted on by almost all the opponents of our Author's claims, and sometimes urged in support of the charge against him of mental derangement.

The first is, *That he has pretended to make additions to the Word of God, and is convicted, ipso facto, of delusion or imposture.*

To suppose however that the writings of Swedenborg, if true, are to be received as new books of Scripture, or that they are either offered by him, or accepted by us, in any such light, is to assume a gross error. Against him have often been quoted these words (or rather *part* of them, for the whole passage evinces its inapplicability) from the conclusion of the Apocalypse: "For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, *If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.*"* Now the whole passage, as here cited, evidently relates, not to the whole Bible, but to the book of the Apocalypse alone, and no more proves that no additional divine communications would ever be made, than the similar declaration in the last book of Moses, "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it,"† proves that no additions to the Word of God were to be made by the latter prophets. If the passage of John the Revelator evinces Swedenborg to be an enthusiast or an impostor, the passage of Moses, by parity of reason, makes impostors or enthusiasts of all the prophets and apostles. Thus, upon any supposition, the text in the Revelation can prove nothing against Swedenborg, and to cite it for that purpose only evinces how eager his opponets have been without much caring about the validity of their arguments, to close the ears of the public against his testimony. But give the words all the extent which such reasoners assign them; admit them to be an authoritative declaration that no addition would ever be made to the

* Ch. xxii. 18, 19.

† Deut. iv. 2.

canon of Scripture ; and they still prove nothing against our author ; for it never entered his thoughts to claim for his writings the sacred character of the Word of God. It was his belief, and it is *ours*, that the canon of Scripture actually was closed by the Revelation of John, though that book does not say so ; and the contents of his writings are presented as truths drawn from the Scriptures now existing, not as new Scriptures given in addition.*

The other objection that I propose here to notice, is exactly the reverse of the former. *It is, That Swedenborg rejects a great part of the Word of God ; and herein again is convicted, ipso facto, of delusion or imposture.*

Although, as we have seen the passage of the Apocalypse just noticed relates to that book only, and the passage in Deuteronomy only to the book of Moses, it cannot be denied, that to reject any book, or any portion of any book, as being part of the Word of God, when it really is such, would be a most unwarrantable piece of presumption ; and to pretend to do so under divine illumination, would be a sure mark either of imposture or of delusion. Accordingly, every effort has been made to bring home this charge against Swedenborg ; and it has been preferred in the most aggravated form. Thus one of our accusers states,† that “the Baron, out of sixty-six books, excludes thirty-two :” and to exaggerate this enormity, and make us objects of horror to the well disposed, he reasons thus : “Now if the Baron be allowed to expel thirty-two books out of the Bible, may not some other courageous man be allowed the same liberty of conscience, and suffered to dismiss at least half a score more ? Then, surely, as we all wish for equal laws and equal rights, another man, finding that several of the books remaining both annoy his practice and bother his conscience, must needs think himself entitled to the privilege of dismissing half a dozen more :” and so he concludes, that “a lusty quarto bible would be reduced to the thickness of an old coin sixpence, long, long before all objectors and Swedenborgians had exercised their imprescriptible rights and their elective franchise.” Without noticing the elegant and liberal style of this *argument*, I will only observe, that it takes a false imputation as its basis. The writer intimates, that we not only reject almost half the bible (though the thirty-two books he mentions, being all very short, make but a small part of the whole in regard to quantity) ; but that we do this, because, in his sublime language, *they annoy our practice and bother our conscience.* The complete contrary

* For an explanation of the difference between the illumination of Swedenborg and the inspiration of those who wrote the Word itself, see the remarks of *Ægiokhus*, on the paper of Dr. Hedge in the *American Christian Examiner*, in the *Int. Rep.* for July, 1834, pp. 187, &c.

† *Anti-Swedenborg*, p. 70.

is the truth. We do not wish to eject from the Bible one book that is now found in it, nor one sentiment, or sentence, or word, from any one book. We consider the books which do not contain any internal sense, — any sense beside the letter — especially all the writings of the Apostles, — as delivering the true doctrines of the Church, and as written by men divinely illuminated in the things of God; thus we are quite satisfied that Paul spoke a real truth when he said, “I think also that I have the spirit of God.” We do not then wish to deny the authority of one sentence that they have written, or to make the least alteration in it; and instead of finding any thing in those books that *annoys our practice and bothers our conscience*, so far as our practice and conscience are formed by our doctrines, we are convinced that every syllable in them is on our side. The objector observes, that “The books excluded are *charged* with having *no internal sense*!” Does he intend then to say, that *they have an internal sense*? By no means. He considers the “charge” to be very true: he ought therefore to acknowledge, that our idea of those books is precisely the same as his own. But we distinguish between books that are written by the highest inspiration, in which every word is suggested to the writer and is the immediate dictate and very word of God, and books which are written from the minds of men under such a divine guidance as secures from error; but of which the words themselves were not immediately given to the penman. This latter is the only kind of inspiration now allowed to any of the books of the Bible by the learned in general; and none of them are aware that any books whatever contain a regular internal or spiritual sense in every word. We, therefore, place a part of the books in the Bible just in the same station as our opponents place the whole, and we respect them as highly as Christians in general respect any portion of them whatever: but the far greater portion we exalt much higher than Christians in general will admit: and thus, because we venerate the Bible, taken altogether, a great deal more than they do, we are maligned as rejecting one half of it.*

If, however, to make a distinction between some books of

* Those who wish to see this subject fully elucidated may consult my work on the *Plenary Inspiration* (App. No. II.), in which it is shown, that the distinction made by us, is only a more accurate definition of that which has been made in all ages, between those books in the Old Testament which are called the Law and the Prophets, and those called the Hagiographa; a similar distinction to which exists among the books of the New Testament likewise. See also the *Int. Rep.* for Jan. 1827, pp. 364—379, where is an article entitled ‘*The New Church Canon of Scripture, as far as regards the Old Testament, advocated by the Electic Review*,’ in which I have recited the large body of evidence, collected by a learned writer in that work, proving that those books only, which Swedenborg recognizes as having an internal sense, belong to the canon of plenary inspired Scripture. So that the New Church by no means stands alone, at the present day, in her decision on this subject.

the Bible and others destroys the authority, as a theological leader, of him who makes it, then there is an end of the authority of the famous Luther, so highly venerated as the great founder of the Protestant Church. If, on this ground, we are to refuse to listen to Swedenborg, we must equally renounce Luther; and shall find no refuge but in returning to the bosom of the infallible Church of Rome, and accepting with her, as the Word of God, not only the whole of the books comprised in the Protestant Bible, but all the Apocrypha — Tobit and his dog — Bel and the Dragon — to boot. Luther upon grounds merely arbitrary, prefers some books before others, and rejects several altogether: witness the following extracts from his works, as quoted by Wetstein in the learned *Prolegomena* to his famous critical edition of the New Testament.* “From these remarks,” says Luther, “you may judge which of the books of the New Testament are the more excellent, namely, John’s Gospel and Paul’s Epistles: these are, in a manner, the kernel and marrow of them all. — The Gospel of John is the genuine and chief Gospel, to be far and far preferred to the three others, and to be much more accounted of. The Epistles of Paul and Peter, also, leave the three Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, at a long distance, behind them. Compared to these, again, the Epistle of James is a mere book of straw: it does not at all savor of the Gospel.” In his Bible, this oracle of the Reformation places the Epistle to the Hebrews, with those of James and Jude, and the Apocalypse, by themselves at the end, with a preface before them, of which the following is an extract: “Thus far we have the genuine books of the New Testament: of those which follow the ancients thought very differently. In the first place, the Epistle to the Hebrews was not written by Paul or by any other Apostle; which I prove as follows,” &c. — “I do not wish to force my opinion on others, but I must say, that I do not think the Epistle of James to be an Apostolic writing, chiefly for this reason; that in a direct contradiction to Paul and the whole of the Scriptures, he attributes justification to works. Besides, that James makes such a jumble and confused mixture of all that he treats upon, that I look upon him to have been some good simple soul who merely committed to paper some sayings he caught hold of from some of the disciples of the Apostles. No one can deny the Epistle of Jude, to be a mere abridgment and copy of the second Epistle of Peter, as it agrees with it almost word for word; so there can be no need to reckon it among the chief books of the New Testament. In regard to the Apocalypse, I leave every one to think as he pleases; only allow me to say, that for more reasons than

* Ed. Semler, p. 457.

one, I do not believe it to be either an Apostolic or prophetic book." To apply Wetstein's remark upon this slashing piece of *sacred* criticism: — Swedenborg is condemned for the judicious discrimination he makes between some books and others without rejecting any: Luther is venerated as an oracle, notwithstanding he, without discrimination, rejects some books altogether, and prefers some of the others to the rest merely as they seem to favor, or otherwise, his favorite notions: — "Let them who can decide thus, consider, whether they are not straining at a gnat, and swallowing a camel!"

On the whole, it is abundantly plain to all who know what Swedenborg teaches on the subject, that he neither attempts to add anything to the Word of God, nor to take aught from it: and to think of raising, out of his sound and truly learned doctrine on this point, a plea against his perfect sanity and solid wisdom, is little short of insanity and weakness of the most preposterous description.

I beg still to add a word on the charge against Swedenborg of mental derangement, to introduce a desperate accusation that has been brought against him.

It may, I believe, be said with truth, that no one can seriously read much of his works, possessing, at the same time, an adequate knowledge of his history, and continue to think him insane. This has been evinced by the conduct of some of the most inveterate of his adversaries. Men prejudiced against him in the strongest degree, and determined to find in his works nothing to approve, have yet felt that the imputation against him of mental derangement could not be supported. None, for instance, would think of casting on a man distinguished through a long life by every virtue, the charge of intentional deception, unless, while anxious to suppress his opinions, they despaired of rendering probable the imputation of a perversion of intellect. The Abbe Barruel one of the most acrimonious of his assailants, was well aware of this; and, accordingly, the accusation of imposture, rather than that of insanity, is that which he chiefly labored to render plausible.* So the author of the "Trial of the Spirits," noticed above,† who exhibits throughout his work a more intemperate hostility and utter disregard of truth than almost any other of Swedenborg's enemies, is constrained to acknowledge that the charge against him of insanity cannot be maintained: so he substitutes for it that of diabolical possess-

* Of which see a most triumphant refutation in *Letters to a Member of Parliament on the Character and Writings of Baron Swedenborg in answer to the Abbe Barruel: by the late Rev. J. Clowes, M. A.*

† Having repeatedly mentioned this publication, I would refer the reader, for a just account of it and its author, to "the Intellectual Repository," Vol. i. Second Series, p. 590, &c., p. 648, &c. and Vol. ii. p. 59. &c., p. 156, &c. It is there proved, that the author is the Rev. W. Ettrick, M. A., of High Barns near Sunderland.

ion! "Swedenborg does not," he says, "seem to have really labored under any natural derangement of his 'interiors,' or vulgar insanity; — but if we acquit him of lunacy or hydrophobia, we cannot absolve him of *diabolomania*."* "If madness of any kind can be rationally imputed to Swedenborg, it can be no ordinary *insanity*, or mere *derangement of intellect*, from *bodily* or even *mental disease*; but must be truly of that species which was also impiously attempted to be charged on the blessed Jesus — a *demoniacal madness*, (Matt. xi. 18.) he hath a devil."† The parallel, in this respect, is, undoubtedly a just one, and the charge is as true in the one case as in the other. We have seen above how exalted and amiable the character of Swedenborg is universally allowed to have been, — how completely serene and happy were his life and death: could such be the state of a man who was the organ of evil spirits? Yet there is no alternative, according to this adversary, (in which we fully agree with him), between believing Swedenborg to have been such an organ, and believing all his writings to be true. Which is the more probable, let the candid reader decide.

Here, then, I close this SECTION on Swedenborg as the Human Instrument for announcing the Second Coming of the Lord, and for communicating the truths then to be discovered; and I trust it has been shown, that there is much to authenticate, and nothing of any validity to impugn, his claims to be accepted in that character.

Why is this not generally seen? Because Christians in general now, like the Jews at the Lord's first advent, have their minds preoccupied with erroneous conceptions respecting spiritual subjects: because, as the Jews were possessed with gross but darling notions respecting the earthly kingdom of the Messiah, and the perpetual carnal observation of the ceremonial law, and thus were disqualified for relishing the spiritual things which he declared were contained in that law; so Christians are possessed with external but fondly cherished sentiments respecting all the great points of the religion of Jesus, and with the persuasion that it is to continue unaltered, as professed by them, till the end of the world; and are thus disqualified for relishing the truly heavenly doctrines and really spiritual ideas which are now shown to be contained in the Word of God. Perceiving, on a slight inspection, that the views presented by Swedenborg oppose their prejudices, few take the trouble to make themselves sufficiently acquainted with his writings to be able to form anything like a correct judgment respecting their truth and credibility: yet I apprehend, even the most prejudiced will hardly deny, that the spiritual sense opened by his

* P 177.

† Pp. 6, 7.

instrumentality, if true, is a discovery of such importance as to be worthily referred to God. But let us hope that the reign of prejudice, though it has lasted long, will soon, in this as in so many other instances, be broken down. The Lord at his coming in the flesh was crucified; no wonder then that, when appearing again in the opening of a higher order of Truth in his Word, he should be rejected: but as he then rose again, and from his throne in heaven extended his reign over multitudes who then first began to acknowledge him, so, doubtless, the hour is coming when an influence from himself in heaven will accompany his Word as opened, — when the prejudices which oppose its reception will be abolished from the minds of multitudes, — and when they will again “look upon him whom they have pierced,” and accept the truth they have denied. Begin then, I intreat you, ye Candid and Reflecting, to use the freedom which, by the accomplishment of the Last Judgment, is restored to the human mind. Suffer, in your own breasts, the power of prejudice to reign no longer. Take the pains fairly to estimate the views of, and from, the Word of God presented by Swedenborg, not rejecting the whole as soon as you find something that differs from your previous opinions, or that you do not immediately understand: and the result, I trust will be, that you will find them, as compared with the Word of God, testifying their own truth by evidence far more convincing than that of miracles, because by evidence that does not merely strike the senses, but reaches the understanding, and affects the heart. Then you will see that the illustrious Swedenborg must indeed have been the Human Instrument for communicating the great truths connected with the second coming of the Lord. If, with any degree of candor, you look at his character and writings without admitting this, you will find the whole an inexplicable riddle.* His writings, you will see, are far too replete with superior views of Divine Truth to be the productions, in its ordinary state, of the human mind: in addition, you will perceive, that they are far too methodical in their form, too soberly as well as sublimely rational, to be the imaginations of a lunatic; and, in further addition, you will acknowledge, that their excellent moral tendency, together with the eminently amiable and virtuous character of their author, render ridiculous the notion, that they can be the offspring either of wilful imposture or of diabolical illusion. What remains, but that you accept them as the result of divine illumination, — the communications of a writer who had really been called to a holy office by the Lord? Admit this, and the mystery is solved. You will be satisfied, that this much calumniated and much mistaken man was as consistent and exalted a character as the world has ever seen: you will confess, that having been selected as the Human In-

* See the remarks on this subject above, pp. 233, 234.

strument for announcing the last great dispensation of gospel truth, though differing from former similar Instruments as much as this differs from former dispensations ; and being, as one of his illustrious predecessors says of himself, “not disobedient unto the heavenly vision ;”* he pursued the course appointed him with as much steadiness and consistency, self-devotion and zeal, as marked the career of a Moses or a Paul : and your hearts will tell you, that, like them, he deserves to have his memory forever embalmed in the grateful recollections of mankind.

HEAVEN AND HELL.

SECTION VI.

HEAVEN AND HELL ; AND THE APPEARANCES IN THEM, AND IN THE INTERMEDIATE REGION, OR WORLD OF SPIRITS.

PART I.

The Human Instrument for opening the Truths to be revealed at the Lord's Second Advent, should be enabled to remove the prevailing Darkness on these Subjects.

IF the character of the illustrious Swedenborg, as the divinely selected Human Instrument for announcing the second coming of the Lord, and for communicating the discoveries of Divine Truth to be then afforded, be satisfactorily established ; and if the reality of his intercourse, in that character, with the spiritual world, be confirmed, as we have seen it is, by indubitable evidences of his supernatural knowledge ; all the objections which are made against him on account of the particulars brought to light by him respecting the hitherto unknown state of man after death, fall at once to the ground. If those particulars are in harmony with his general system of doctrine, and his general system of doctrine, including that part of it which relates to this subject, is securely founded on the Scriptures, it is the height of absurdity to reject them, and with them the whole of his system, because they clash with some unfounded prejudices of our own. Most men avow, that, in regard to all which relates to the life of man after death, beyond the simple fact that there is a future existence, they are involved in the deepest ignorance : yet offer them any specific information on the subject, and they reject it as untrue, with a decision which would only be justifiable, did they already possess respecting it the most

* Acts xxvi. 19.

accurate knowledge. Supremely interesting to an immortal being as is the nature of the state on which he enters at the death of the body, the opposers of the New Church act as if it were here a high privilege to be in the dark. Allow me, then, now to appeal to you my Candid and Reflecting Readers, on this much misrepresented and much misunderstood part of our Author's testimony and writings.

It is, we are all aware, (and it may be expedient, first, to meet that objection with a few remarks), a great offence with many in this Sadducean age, that our Author should profess to have had open communication with the spiritual world; to have been so in the spirit,—and this, as he declares, not when he was asleep but when he was wide awake,—as to be able to communicate with those in the world of spirits, or the first receptacle of souls after death, and occasionally with those in heaven and with those in hell; as also to behold the appearances which exist in all those places and states respectively. The writer of this Appeal can here speak feelingly; for it was this which he found most repulsive, when first, by the kindness of Providence, the writings of Swedenborg came into his hands. Permit me, then, here to appeal to you from my own experience.

Accustomed, as is so commonly the case at this day, to consider the other world and this to be separated by an impassable barrier, I could scarcely believe it possible for an inhabitant of the natural world to have any open communication with the spiritual,—not even by the special gift and providing of the Lord. Hence I at first ridiculed what I read (for the first book I opened was the *Treatise on Heaven and Hell*), beautiful, sublime, and affecting, as were the views presented. But examining further, the superior views on all the subjects of religious doctrine which the writings of Swedenborg every where exhibit, and the luminous explanations they offer of the Word of God, entirely convinced me, that, in these respects, he was truly an enlightened and safe guide. And then such thoughts as these occurred: “I am able, by the faculties with which God in mercy has endowed us, and by recurring to the standard in the Word of God, to form a judgment of the theological sentiments contained in these writings: and I feel with the utmost conviction,—I see in the clearest light,—that these are certainly true. But can he who is faithful in much, be unfaithful in that which is least? If his statements respecting his spiritual intercourse are unfounded, they must either be the offspring of derangement or of a systematic attempt at deception. But to suppose that a man who communicates, on many most important subjects, such superior ideas, and who always writes with such perfect order and consistency, could have lost his reason, is a violation of all reason and sound judgment. If,

then, his representations respecting the other world are not true, it cannot be because the Author was himself deceived: he must be a wilful deceiver, or none. But how could a man of bad intention, which always darkens the understanding on spiritual subjects, deliver views of truth so truly heavenly and glorious? Besides, how could a man of the irreproachable character which all testimony, of friends and foes, equally allows him, of the genuine piety which all his writings breathe,—invent such stories to deceive? The idea is monstrous. I must take then the whole of his writings together, and interpret the one part by the other: and as I can see that everything in them, of which it falls within the province of reason to judge, is certainly true, I may safely take those mere matters of fact, of which my reason can go no farther in its judgment than to see that they are not impossible, upon his authority. Besides, why should they not be probable as well as possible? He does not in the least resemble the common herd of pretenders to supernatural communications: the *importance* of his information is fully equal to its singularity. His writings explain the nature and meaning of the second coming of the Lord, and of the New Jerusalem which is to accompany it. They prove, also, that the state of religion in the Christian world at this day, is precisely such as, it is predicted, would be the case, when those great events should arrive. Arrive at some time they must. Suppose then this should be the time, and he really is the appointed instrument for declaring them: in this case, that he should be admitted to the privilege of an intercourse with the spiritual world seems a matter of necessity. Besides: *What subject is there in which the human mind at this day is enveloped in greater darkness, than in all that concerns the nature of the eternal world? What then can be so reasonable as to expect, that, among the communications which would be imparted to mankind in the day of the second coming of the Lord and appearing of the New Jerusalem, information respecting the eternal world, its appearances and its laws, would form a prominent subject?* And how could this so naturally be imparted, as by opening the spiritual sight of some inhabitant of the earth, and permitting him to report what he had witnessed?" It was thus that I then reasoned, and in deciding accordingly I found peace and joy: and the forty years which have since passed have only added strength to the conviction, that I then reasoned and decided aright. My experience has been that of many, and will be that of many more.

But what is there in Swedenborg's pretensions on this subject which is not sanctioned by the experience of those who have formerly filled a similar office? Did not the Apostle Peter behold as extraordinary a vision as any that is detailed in the "Memorable Relations" of Swedenborg, when he beheld "a

certain vessel descending unto him, as it had been a great sheet, knit at the four corners, and let down to the earth; wherein were all manner of four-footed beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air. And there came a voice to him, Rise, Peter, kill and eat.”* Does not the Apostle Paul declare, that to him, revelations from heaven were things of common occurrence? He says, — and *states it among his claims to respect and attention, not as what ought to involve his pretensions in doubt and denial*, — “I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord. I knew a man in Christ, [meaning himself], about fourteen years ago, (whether in the body or out of the body I cannot tell; God knoweth); such a one caught up to the third heaven. And I know such a man (whether in the body or out of the body I cannot tell; God knoweth); how that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not possible for man to utter. Of such a one will I glory. — And lest I should be exalted above measure through *the abundance of the revelations*, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, a messenger of Satan, to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure.”† Communications with the spiritual world, then, were common with the apostles, and were regarded by them as properly belonging to their office: and specific examples of them abound throughout the Scriptures both of the Old and New Testament. So, if we are to give any credit to the unanimous assertion of all the primitive fathers, similar communications were extremely frequent in the early ages of Christianity. But, without adverting to these, the possibility of such communications cannot be denied by any believer of the Scriptures. Surely then we may say, that, standing in the situation in which Swedenborg asserts he did, he would have been but half qualified for his work had he been without them. His pretending to them does not, indeed, afford proof that his other pretensions are true; but it makes the whole consistent, and thus it gives to the whole the character of higher probability. In him, as the instrument for restoring the true knowledge of religious truth, they were entirely in place. Without them, all that he advances besides would have lost half its claims to attention. And if the information communicated by him is far more distinct than had ever been made known on such subjects before, this, also, is precisely what, under the circumstances, was to have been expected. If the knowledge respecting life and immortality, brought to light at the first promulgation of the gospel, greatly exceeded in clearness what the world previously possessed; it surely was to be expected, that the knowledge on the same subjects unfolded at the Lord’s second advent, would rise in distinctness above that communicated at

* Acts x. 11, 12, 13.

† 2 Cor. xii. 1 — 5, 7.

his first, in the same ratio as this transcended the mere shadows afforded under the Mosaic dispensation. Is it, then, the part of sound reason to reject the information communicated, for being what, if true, it assuredly ought to be? Is it the part of sound judgment to conclude, respecting Swedenborg, from the mere fact of his asserting that he had such communications with the spiritual world, as, if his pretensions were true, he ought to have had, that therefore his pretensions were false? We surely cannot justly come to such a conclusion, till, after having weighed all that he offers as the result of his communications in the balances of Scripture and Reason, we have found them wanting. The principal of the discoveries thus imparted, and of the objections made to them, shall be examined in distinct PARTS of this SECTION.

SECTION VI.

HEAVEN AND HELL; AND THE APPEARANCES IN THEM, AND
IN THE INTERMEDIATE REGION, OR WORLD OF SPIRITS.

PART II.

The Inhabitants of Heaven and Hell are all from the Human Race.

Nothing can be of greater importance, in order to our forming just conceptions respecting the eternal world, than to be acquainted with the nature and origin of its inhabitants. On this subject, very wild imaginations have existed; and persons of fertile invention, in all nations, have deemed themselves at liberty to people the invisible worlds *ad libitum*. Various families of spiritual beings have been dreamed of, from angels and genii only inferior to deities in not being self-existent, to fairies and brownies, the familiar visitants of the rustic's haunts; all of different race from the human. Christian theology, indeed, has rejected many of these tribes, as the mere offspring of heathen superstition; but Christian theology, as generally received, has exempted one class of such beings from the general proscription, and has authorized the belief of a race of celestials, originally created such; including a race of infernals, originally created angels of light, but changed, by rebellion and forfeiture, into angels of darkness.

Swedenborg, having been admitted to the privilege of intimate communication with the inhabitants of the spiritual world, has done more towards rationalizing our notions respecting

them than any other writer that ever existed. Being commissioned to make known the truths respecting the eternal world necessary to remove the darkness at present existing on that subject, and to impart such knowledge respecting it as the present state of the human mind requires, and which, therefore, it was fitting should be revealed at the Lord's second advent; he has been enabled conclusively to show, that the prejudice in favor of the existence of angels, originally created such, has no more title to indulgence, than the superstitions about genii and fairies; and that there does not exist in all the heavens a single angel, nor in all hell a single infernal, nor in any region of creation a single spiritual being (the Divine being alone excepted) who did not first come into existence as a man, upon this or some other of the earths in the universe.

This discovery is one, which ought equally to recommend itself to acceptance by its sublimity and its simplicity. But the common systems of doctrine, if they might be supported without the belief of good angels originally created such, cannot stand a moment without the notion of a mighty personal Devil, of power to act as the antagonist of the Almighty. Accordingly, the assailants of the heavenly doctrines of the New Church, have zealously labored to overturn our views on the origin of angels and devils. This being a general subject, a just conception of which will tend to throw light upon many more particulars relating to Heaven and Hell, shall be considered, therefore, before we proceed further.

The opponent whom, in this work, I have taken as my chief guide as to the subjects to be considered and the objections to be answered, here evidently expects to have the prejudices of his readers on his side; as will doubtless be the case with those who adopt as their Bible, on this subject, Milton's *Paradise Lost*; in which work is supplied that *information* respecting the pre-existence and fall of angels, which the Scriptures have withheld. Eager to anticipate a triumph, he indulges in a modest and elegant philippic against the enlightened Author who has exposed the error. "This extraordinary man (says he) is not content with *changing times and seasons* in this world, but he will needs revolutionize (at least reform) the two invisible worlds! He first rectifies the *person* of the Divine Being — then he new-models the *atonement* — then again he makes a new thing of the *mediatorship* — after which he proceeds to abolish the *resurrection* — onward he goes to the *day of judgment*, and having snugly set that aside, he proceeds, Jehu like, to shove all the *angels* in heaven, as well as all the *devils* in hell, out of existence!"*

* Anti Swedenborg, p. 62.

They who have recourse to ridicule, ought first to consider whether it can be retorted. Now what ampler field could be found for its exercise, than in the common notions of pre-existing (I use that term in reference to the creation of man), warring, and falling angels? I will not however resort to it. I will merely state the circumstances as commonly described, and leave the reader to judge whether the holders of such sentiments are entitled to ridicule those who reject them.

The Creator, it is conceived, having produced an immense but definite number of angels, remained satisfied in the midst of his work, till the most exalted of them became his rival,

“And durst defy the Omnipotent to arms;”

whereupon (astonishing to relate!) a *third part* of the angelic host, — beings of the highest communicable goodness and intelligence, — ranged themselves under the banners of the apostate, and waged battle with their Maker. This was the occasion of the creation of the world: for after the ejection of the rebel angels, the Victor determined to produce another race of beings to supply their place in his affections. The case is thus stated, according to Milton, by the vanquished chief; who merely delivers the popular belief, adding nothing of his own but a very natural reflection:

“HE, to be avenged,
And to repair his numbers thus impaired,
Whether such virtue spent of old now failed
More angels to create (if they at least
Are his created), or to spite us more,
Determined to advance into our room
A creature formed of earth, and him endow
With heavenly spoils (our spoils):”*

Now, can any thing be more puerile than the whole of this story? Does the mythology of the heathens contain a tale more extravagant? Are common theologians to be at liberty to people a *third part* of heaven, and a much greater proportion of hell, with men, and is Swedenborg to be described as “*shoving* all the angels in heaven and all the devils in hell out of existence,” because he affirms they *all* originally, were

* Take the following as an appropriate comment upon the above text. I am assured that the opponent with whom I have here to deal, has sometimes, in his sermons, undertaken to inform his hearers, how the saints are endowed with the “spoils” of the fallen angels. When the latter, he avers, were cast out of heaven, they left their thrones vacant behind them, with their crowns hung above them on pegs: every saint who dies enters on possession of one of the vacant thrones, and taking the crown over it from its peg, places it on his head: and the occupying of the last throne and unloading of the last peg, will be the signal for the sounding of the last trumpet and the end of the world.

either good or wicked men? If to deprive of existence a multitude of imaginary beings to supply their places with real ones, be a sin against orthodoxy; is not to thrust into hell a third part of those who were once safe in heaven, and to supply their place with beings of a totally different nature and origin, a sin against consistency, reason, and credibility?

The common notions respecting angels and devils, are then, we find sufficiently open to ridicule: Is it equally ridiculous to affirm that angels and men are of the same family, and that heaven and hell are from the human race?

What is man? The Scriptures assure us, that he is a being created in the image and likeness of God. This is the proper and intrinsic nature of *man*, however he may have departed from it: and is it possible to employ any other language that will accurately define the intrinsic nature of an *angel*? Is an angel *more* than an image and likeness of God? This would be saying that angels absolutely *are* Gods. An image and likeness of God is a being who receives life, love, and wisdom, of a genuine and heavenly nature from God: and is not this the definition both of a man and of an angel? To possess life, love, and wisdom in himself, is the prerogative of God alone: to possess life derivatively, accompanied with a species of love of a merely natural kind, and with instincts supplying the place of wisdom, without a capacity to recede from or alter them, belongs to the brute creation alone: and to possess life derivatively, accompanied with a power of rising from natural love to spiritual, and attaining to the enjoyment of a love and wisdom truly human, imaging the divine love and wisdom from which they are derived, belongs to the only other conceivable order of animated creatures,—the only species of being that can exist between the all-perfect, the infinitely wise and good God, and the irrational animal. Such a being is man: and such a man, when he has passed from this natural into the spiritual sphere of existence, is an angel. Did the order which the Divine Being has laid down for the conduct of his own operations admit of the production of angels in a more immediate manner, who can suppose that men would ever have been created? Why were we not all created as angels at once, without being exposed to the dangers attendant on our coming into existence in this world of nature, could the same end have been attained without it? If some were called into being at the end of the goal, and created angels immediately, why are we, who, all allow, are eventually to be not at all inferior to angels, placed at such a distance from it here? Why, but because there is no other entrance to the angelic state, and in order that we may be angels, it is necessary that we should be men? Infinite

Wisdom and Divine Omnipotence never act, we may be assured, but in conformity to the most perfect order; and how satisfactory is the view which teaches, what indeed experience demonstrates, that order requires that there should be distinct degrees of life and existence, intimately connected together and all dependent on each other; that the interior degrees, in order to their permanence, should have an exterior and ultimate one as a basis on which, as it were, they might rest; that in the masterpiece of creation, all the degrees of life, from first to last, should exist together, with a capacity of being successively opened; that the human mind should be formed while it dwells in a natural frame, in order that it may have a termination to give its acquirements a fixed existence; that all multiplication, and, in fact, all actual creation, should take place in the exterior and ultimate sphere of being; and that hence man is produced an inhabitant of the world of nature, in order that he might afterwards lay aside his clay and appear an angel before the throne of God,—thus that man is produced that angels might exist, and that God might gratify his love by surrounding himself with a continually increasing multitude of beings, capable, in the highest communicable degree of consciously receiving, and of acknowledging his benefits! Thus also we obtain a view of creation as one coherent whole,—yea, we view as one coherent whole the entire chain of being, from the crude globe of earth to the source of all in God: and thus we are enabled to see, that man, the only being created in the image and likeness of God, is not, what the contrary view supposes,—a superfluity among the works of his Creator.*

But from reason let us go to Scripture, where we shall find the most explicit testimony to the doctrine that angels are men.

An opponent would fain reduce our proofs from this source to a single (or rather double) text. “The Baron,” says one, “supports this doctrine chiefly, as I understand him, by the following text, ‘And I John saw these things, and heard them; and when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship at the feet of the angel which showed me these things. Then saith he unto me, See thou do it not: for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God.’ (Rev. xxii. 8, 9; see also Rev. xix. 10.)”† These words, it is contended, only mean, that angels, as well as men, are servants of the Most High. “This,” says the objector, “I am certain is the opinion of the

* See the quotation from Swedenborg above, pp. 146, 147.

† Anti-Swedenborg, p. 62.

best divines. Whereas the Baron will understand the words, 'I am thy fellow-servant and of thy brethren the prophets,' to signify, 'I am a departed spirit of one of thy brethren, or one of the prophets.' But the premises will not warrant the conclusion: and, as far as I can find, the Baron stands alone in his opinion;" &c. This is curious indeed. This text, on which it is wished to have it supposed "the Baron chiefly supports his doctrine," and "in his opinion" of the meaning of which he stands alone," — *is never once applied by him to the subject!* Had he done so, however, he would not have stood alone, as may be learned from so well known a book as Doddridge's Family Expositor; in a note of which we read, that "Mr. Fleming understands it [Rev. xix. 10], to mean, *I am one of thy brethren*, which he thinks intimates that this was the departed spirit of an apostle; perhaps St. Peter or St. Paul, or his own brother James, though not in a form to be known. And he thinks the person speaking, ch. xxii. 9, might be the spirit of one of the prophets, perhaps Isaiah, Ezekiel, or Daniel." And was not Watts one of "the best divines?" But he says on the text, "These words naturally lead one to think, that though he appeared as a messenger from Christ, and in the form of an angel, yet he was really a departed spirit, a brother, a fellow-prophet; perhaps the soul of David, of Isaiah, or Moses."* Assuredly, *the words* do most *naturally lead one to think so*; whatever they who desire to make angels a different species from men may pretend to the contrary.

But there is abundance of texts which are not at all equivocal. If angels are a different race from men, how is it that they are called, almost wherever their appearance is mentioned, throughout the Scriptures, by the name of men? Thus of the three angels that appeared to Abraham, it is said that "he looked, and lo, three *men*, stood by him:"† and of the two of them that went on to Sodom, the people said, "Where are the *men* which came in to thee this night?"‡ Lot said of them, "Only to these *men* do nothing:"§ and the inspired historian himself repeatedly gives them the same title.|| When Jacob wrestled with an angel, it is said, that "there wrestled a *man* with him until the breaking of the day."¶ When Joshua was by Jerico, "he lifted up his eyes, and looked, and behold there stood a *man* over against him with a drawn sword in his hand," who declared himself to be "the captain of the host of the Lord."** Of the angel who appeared to the wife of Noah, she said, "*A man of God* came to me, and his countenance was like the countenance of an angel of God;"†† and

* Works, vol. ii. p. 401. † Gen. xviii. 2. ‡ Ch. xix. 5. § Ver. 8.
 || Ver. 10, 12, 16. ¶ Ch. xxxii. 24. ** Josh. v. 13, 14. †† Jud. xiii. 6.

afterwards she said to her husband, "behold the *man* hath appeared unto me that came unto me the other day. And," it is added, "Manoah arose, and went after his wife, and came to the *man*, and said unto him, Art thou the *man* that spakest unto the woman? And he said, I am."* The "*man* clothed with linen, with a writer's inkhorn by his side," seen by Ezekiel,† was doubtless an angel; as was the "*man* whose appearance was like the appearance of brass, with a line of flax in his hand, and a measuring reed," who showed him the vision of the temple, &c.‡ The angel Gabriel, sent to Daniel, is called "the *man* Gabriel."§ That prophet afterwards beheld "a certain *man* clothed in linen, whose loins were girded with fine gold of Uphaz."|| Zechariah saw "a *man* riding upon a red horse," who is presently called "the angel of the Lord."¶ The women who went to the Lord's sepulchre, on entering in, saw a *young man* sitting on the right side, clothed in a long white garment:** and according to Luke, "two *men* stood by them in shining garments;"†† who, according to John were "two *angels* in white."‡‡ Finally, John the Revelator identifies angels with men, by informing us, that the angel "measured the wall" of the New Jerusalem, "a hundred and forty-four cubits, according to the measure of a *man*, that is, of the *angel*."§§

Here angels are explicitly affirmed to be men; and many other passages might be adduced, in which to angels are ascribed the attributes of men, and in which they evidently were seen as men by those to whom they appeared; indeed, it is palpably certain that they never were seen otherwise than as men. How is this to be accounted for, if they are in reality a totally different race, of other origin and dissimilar nature? I know the fiction to which expositors have recourse: they tell us that they assumed the human shape, by clothing themselves with a material vehicle for the occasion, and are then called men from their assumed appearance: but what a clumsy mode of explaining the fact is this, and how totally destitute of a shadow of ground in Scripture! Where do we read of an angel's thus *creating a human body* in which to represent himself before the corporeal eye of men, and *dissipating it again* at his disappearance? How much less operosely is the case accounted for by supposing, that, man being himself similar in nature to angels as to his interior constitution, on closing his bodily senses and opening the sight of his spirit, he immediately sees an angel, if present, *in his own proper form*; who again

* Ver, 10, 11.

† Ch, ix. 2, 3, 11; x. 2, 3, 6.

‡ Ch. xl. 3, 4, &c.

§ Ch. ix. 21.

|| Ch. x. 5; xii. 6, 7.

¶ Ch. i. 8, 11.

** Mark xvi. 5.

†† Ch. xxiv. 4.

‡‡ Ch. xx. 12.

§§ Ch. xxi. 17.

must necessarily vanish in a moment on the closing of the spiritual sight of the beholder, and the seat of his perception returning again into the body? If, then, as would hence appear, the human form is the proper form of an angel, how can it be doubted that angels and men are the same beings in different stages of their existence? What would a naturalist say, were we to present him with an animal possessing the exact form of an ox, but were to tell him that he must not argue from its form to its nature, for this, he might be assured was that of a very superior animal? When it shall be right not to believe the animal which wears the form of an ox to be one, we may also venture to conclude, that the angels of Scripture, who always wear the form of men, and often are called such, are not what they are called and seem. When we can no longer trust our eyes, and believe, on their testimony, that oxen are oxen, we may refuse to trust the Scriptures, and to believe, on their testimony, that angels are men.

As this is the clear deposition on this subject, of reason and Scripture, it was seen to be so by many in the early times of Christianity, and by some since; though the Jewish fables about angels of different race and their falling from heaven, began too soon to infect the Christian church. Thus, upon the identity as to the nature of angels and men, the celebrated "father," Origen, quotes from another writer, whom he does not name, these striking and well-discriminated remarks. "Moreover, a certain other writer, using that testimony, 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, affirms, that whatever is made after the image of God, is man: and he brings myriads of examples to prove, that the Scripture uses the terms *man* and *angel* indifferently, applying both terms to the same subject; as in the case of three who were entertained by Abraham, and the two who visited Sodom; and so through the whole series of the Scriptures, which sometimes call the same beings angels, and sometimes men. So likewise, he who is of this opinion will say, that as some who are acknowledged to be men are angels too,—as John the Baptist, of whom it is written, 'Behold I send my *angel* before thy face;'—so the angels of God are called by that name because it belongs to their employment, instead of being called by the name of men which belongs to their nature." * In another place, the same father, delivering his own sentiments, thus represents all angels as having once been men: "I conclude it to be evident from hence [the Lord's answer to the Sadducees] that it is not merely by not marrying and being given in marriage that they who are esteemed worthy of the resurrection from the

Com. in Joh. t. iii.

dead become as the angels in heaven, but also because their vile bodies, being transfigured, become such as are the bodies of angels, ethereal, and having the appearance of light. If this doctrine should appear strange to many believers, let any one inquire, as he may do, probably, from many other passages, but certainly from that before us, whether, since they who rise from the dead are as the angels in heaven, and *pass from the rank of men into that of angels*, so also other angels in heaven, having once been men, and having, when in the bodies of men, fought the good fight, are become angels of heaven; as certain others, again, had done before them.”* It is true that Origen does not always write so consistently, but mixes with these intelligent views some fancies of Jewish and heathen origin: but for all his opinions on this subject, true and erroneous, his editor, the learned Huet, a Roman Catholic bishop, makes this apology; — that the church had not in his time defined with sufficient clearness what ought to be believed in regard to angels;† thus acknowledging, that the general prevalence of the notions now received was owing to the decrees of the prevailing party, that is, of the Romish church, in latter times.

But that the common perceptions of mankind, and the genuine light of Scripture, have never on this subject, been entirely extinguished, is evident from the following beautiful lines of Young; a writer who, when submitting his own understanding to an erroneous doctrine, sometimes, as we have seen above, suffers his pen to run into the grossest absurdities; but who, when, without regard to human creeds, he writes from his own feelings and perceptions, and from the light of the Word itself, often delivers the most affecting, uncommon and elevated truths: he says,

“ Why doubt we, then, the glorious truth to sing? —
 Angels are men of a superior kind;
 Angels are men in lighter habit clad,
 High o’er celestial mountains winged in flight:
 And men are angels, loaded for an hour,
 Who wade this miry vale, and climb, with pain
 And slippery step the bottom of the steep.
 Angels their failings, mortals have their praise:
 While here, of corps ethereal; such enrolled,
 And summoned to the glorious standard soon,
 Which flames eternal crimson through the skies.”

The New Jerusalem doctrine on this subject being so conclusively established by reason, Scripture, and the best human

* *In Matt.* t. xvii.

† *Origeniana*, 1, ii. § 1.

authority, proceed we to examine what is urged against it. To authenticate, against such evidence, the irrational, and, to all appearance, palpably fabulous notions, about angels created such, wars in heaven, and a fallen angel who is a sort of Anti-God, very strong testimony ought surely to be required.

The two first texts that are put forth are the following; which have indeed always been regarded as the main bulwarks of the doctrine: "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day."* "For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness to be reserved unto judgment:" &c.†

Formerly, I confess, I much wondered what these texts could really mean, and had consulted numerous writers on them without finding anything satisfactory. At last I was providentially conducted into a channel of inquiry, which led to a solution of the question so perfectly clear and conclusive, as cannot be denied or evaded.

It is to be noted, that neither of the Apostles delivers the circumstances he relates as original information, but both bring them in incidentally, as things well known to their readers, to draw from them an argument on another subject. Peter affirms‡ that false teachers would come, and Jude§ that they had come; and both argue to the judgments which would overtake them from the judgments which had overtaken the wicked in ancient times, and with which their readers were acquainted.

Whence then was this history of the angels that sinned, and their punishment, known to those to whom these Epistles were written? The other occurrences referred to are contained in the Scriptures (except that we read nothing in the Scriptures of Noah's being "a preacher of righteousness," as he is called by Peter||): but our Scriptures make no mention of any transgressing angels. In the Septuagint Greek version, however, they who, in the Hebrew original and in our translation, are called "the sons of God,"¶ who formed connections with "the daughters of men,"-are called "the angels of God." Here, then, we have some clew to the circumstance intended; but still it evidently is not to the book of Genesis that the two Apostles refer; for this contains no notice, even as given in the Septuagint version, of the punishment that befel the transgressing angels. Some fuller record, necessarily an apocryphal one, must therefore have then been extant, containing the particulars which the two Apostles mention.

* Jude 6.

§ Ver. 4.

† 2 Pet. ii, 4.

|| Ver. 5.

‡ Ver. 1.

¶ Gen. vi. 2, 4.

Now Jude, a little below, quotes an apocryphal book by name. "Enoch," says he, "the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints," &c.* This book of Enoch was well known to the early Christian writers, who often mention it: but it at length disappeared and was supposed to be entirely lost. A fragment of it was discovered, three hundred years ago, by Jos. Scaliger; but as it did not contain the words quoted by Jude, doubts were entertained whether it was the genuine work. At length an Ethiopic version of the whole book was brought from Abyssinia by the celebrated traveler, Mr. Bruce, which has since been translated into English by Dr. Lawrence; and in this are found the quotations of Jude, and the whole of the fragment discovered by Scaliger. Now as it thus is proved that Jude had the book of Enoch before him when he wrote his epistle, and formally quotes from it a passage which he conceived applicable to those of whom he is speaking, it is natural to suppose that he might be referring to the same book when he mentions the transgressing angels and their fate. Such is proved to be the fact. The book of Enoch contains at large a pretended history of the angels who transgressed with the daughters of men, and *mentions the exact circumstances repeated by Jude and Peter.*

The means of setting this question at rest were actually afforded by the fragment of the book of Enoch discovered by Scaliger; as was remarked by Scaliger himself, who, assigning his reasons for publishing it, states "the chief of them to be, because the passage which is produced in the Epistle of Jude respecting the transgressing angels, is manifestly taken from this fragment."† Yet, strange to say, the commentators in general have passed it by in silence! Most reluctant, they evidently have been, to have it known, that the only imagined Scripture authority for the belief in fallen angels, was an imaginary authority, and no more. I find but one who has deduced from the book of Enoch the origin of the story; and that is the famous German *rationalist*, Dr. Semler; a writer whose own sentiments, in many respects, I regard as most erroneous and pernicious; but whose great learning and thorough acquaintance with early ecclesiastical history, well qualified him for investigating what he calls *the historical sense* of the apostolical writings: in regard to which he certainly has made some valuable discoveries. We have no reason to regard him with favor; for he wrote, in German, a tract against our doctrines: but *fas est et ab hoste doceri*; wherefore I will here translate some

* Ver. 14, 15.

† *Et quod caput est*, &c. See Lawrence's Prel. Dis. p. xx.

extracts from the notes to his Paraphrase of the Second Epistle of Peter.

On the words, *For if God spared not the angels that sinned*, he remarks, "Here almost all the Christian interpreters, being destitute of the light of history, and influenced by the authority of their system, have been so led into error as not to perceive, that the author is here speaking, as does Jude also, of the history related in Gen. vi. The received form of theology has led them to refer these words to occurrences supposed to have taken place before the fall of man, brought about by the prince of evil angels. Beza himself* severely reprehends the vain studies of divines, whom he represents as being made fools of by Satan, who withdraws them from the business of salvation, and engages them in speculating about such matters as what day of the world that fall of angels happened on, and whether it was before the foundation of this lower world; what was the sin by which Satan fell; and how many angels he drew with him. — But neither Beza nor even Grotius was aware, that the writer of the epistle is here referring to Gen. vi., *with the commentary upon it contained in the book of Enoch*. And although the advice which Beza gives on the occasion is useful and weighty, 'to learn soberly to take our knowledge from the Word of God, and to be content with what the Holy Spirit has revealed;' yet it is here out of place. *For the Holy Spirit did not reveal* what we read here, and in Jude 6. Beza, without any authority for it, assigns the knowledge of what is here related to an *unwritten tradition*, from which he supposes the fall of angels was known to the fathers. But Christians ought to be aware that *unwritten traditions* containing any useful truth, and derived from God, were by no means to be found among the Jews at that time, who, having adopted the fables of the gentiles about the operations of demons, propagated nothing but mere superstition and darkness." — Again, on the words, "but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness," (where the phrase "cast them down to hell" is expressed in the original by one word — *tartaros* — which occurs no where else in the New Testament, and means, "having committed them to *tartarus*,") Dr. S. has these observations: "The word *tartaros* is taken from the Grecian mythology. Tartarus is represented as a kind of prison, in which darkness supplies the place of chains. In the book of Enoch (p. 191 of the *Codex Pseudepigraphus* of Fabricius), Azazel [a leader of the sinning angels] is said to be *bound hand and foot, and cast into darkness, to be brought forth to the burning in the day of judgment*. In like manner, (p. 194), Semiazas [another of their leaders] is

* Calvin's disciple and successor.

bound with his companions for seventy generations under the hills of the earth, until the accomplishment of the judgment of the age of ages. — Thus the transaction is taken from that book of Enoch."

The passages here cited by Dr. Semler, from the Greek fragment, are, as found at length in the Ethiopic, and translated by Dr. Lawrence, as follows: "Again the Lord said to Raphael, *Bind Azazyel, hand and foot; cast him into darkness; and opening the desert which is in Dudael, cast him in there. Throw upon him hurled and pointed stones; covering him with darkness; there shall he remain forever; cover his face that he may not see the light; and in the great day of judgment let him be cast into the fire.*"* "To Michael likewise the Lord said, go and announce (his crime) to Samyaza, and to the others who are with him, who have been associated with women, that they might be polluted with all their impurity. And when all their sons shall be slain, when they shall see the perdition of their beloved, *bind them for seventy generations underneath the earth, even to the day of judgment, and of consummation, until the judgment, (the effect of) which will last for ever, be completed.*"†

Here, then, evidently, we have the history referred to by the two Apostles; — of Peter's "angels that sinned, who were cast down to Tartarus. [the desert in Dudael], and delivered into chains of darkness to be reserved unto judgment;" — of Jude's "angels which kept not their *principality*, but left their own habitation, and are reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day."

This passage of Jude is still further explained by the book of Enoch. Our translation calls them "the angels which kept not their *first estate*," the original word being *arche*, which does indeed signify *beginning*; but it also signifies *government* or *principality*, and is often so translated in the New Testament. The history of the book of Enoch proves that it bears this sense here. These angels are there called the *watchers*, and their duty was to oversee the affairs of men; this then was their *arche*, government or principality: and for this end they were stationed in the air at no great distance from the earth: this then was "their own habitation."

In the book of Enoch, also, we find the reason why Noah is called "a preacher of righteousness;" for it contains a prophecy pretended to have been delivered by Noah.

Thus, then, it is indisputable, that these texts of Peter and Jude, the only texts in the Bible which can be thought to speak explicitly of the pre-existence and fall of angels afford no sup-

* Ch. x. 6—9.

† Ver. 15.

port to those notions whatever. They afford no support to the doctrine of *the pre-existence of angels*, because the sinning angels spoken of are not those who are imagined to have fallen before the foundation of the world, but those who were supposed to have transgressed with the daughters of men. They afford no countenance to the notion that *angels are a different race of men*, because the apocryphal story referred to is founded upon what is now acknowledged by all to be a misconception of the relation in Gen. vi; for no one will now pretend that "the sons of God" there mentioned were *angels* of any kind. They afford no support to *any doctrine whatever*; because they are mere allusions to a forged and apocryphal book, addressed to the reader in the way of an *argumentum ad hominem*; as Paul sometimes quotes both from apocryphal and heathen writers. This is the way in which the learned account for Jude's express citation* from the book of Enoch; and unless it be admitted, the two Epistles must themselves be regarded as apocryphal; as was done by many in ancient times, and by some (especially as to that of Jude, which is rejected by Michaelis) at the present day. I am by no means inclined to consider them spurious: many parts of them exhibit, I am satisfied, the enlightened mind of an Apostle: but no one, surely, will assert, that an allusion to an apocryphal tale about angels who took wives of the daughters of men, affords any proof of the pre-existence of angels, and the fall from heaven of Satan.

The next text cited against us is John viii. 44: "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it." How this text can be supposed to prove that angels existed before men were created, and that some of them fell out of heaven, I cannot understand. Even upon the common theory, how can the devil have been a murderer *from the beginning*, supposing him to have *begun* his existence as an angel of light? But it is supposed that his pre-existence as an angel of light is implied by its being said, that "he *abode not* in the truth." In the original it is, "he *stood* not in the truth:" which does not necessarily imply that, having first been in the truth, he did not remain in it, but rather, that he never *was stationed* in the truth; and that this is the true intention of the phrase is rendered certain by its being added, "because there is no truth in him;" or, more literally, "because the truth is not in him." If then we understand a personal being to be spoken of, who, having orig-

* Ver. 14, 15

inally been in heaven, fell out of it, we must understand the cause of his fall to be, that he could not help it. He was a devil from the beginning, created an alien from the truth. Who will impute the production of such a being to the Creator? Understand these words of a personal being, and they involve a blasphemy; you either impute the origin of your personal devil, *as* a devil, to the Creator; or you suppose the devil to be an Anti-god, uncreated and self-existing. But understand *the devil* here to be the principle of evil in the abstract, or rather, to be a personification of the root of all evil, which is the love of self; and all becomes consistent. It is the evil of self-love, or self-love when made the sole or governing spring of action, that prompts to all deeds of violence and deceit, — that makes murderers and liars. In divine language, all personal beings are named according to their qualities: hence, because this horrid principle reigns in hell, its inhabitants, singly, are also called *devils*; hence Judas is called by the Lord *a devil*;* and hence, likewise, all individual devils, considered as forming one aggregate evil power, are denominated *the devil*. But when, as here, the devil *from the beginning* is spoken of, it must mean the principle in its deepest ground, — in its merest abstract nature, when it first began to operate in the breast of man, and before they who became personal devils by cherishing it had passed from this world into the region of the spiritual world called hell.

“Whereupon are the foundations thereof (the earth) fastened? or who laid the corner-stone thereof; when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?”† Jehovah himself is the being here represented as speaking: but would He, who knows infinitely more of the truths of astronomy than ever man discovered, describe the earth, if his words were intended to be literally understood, as being *founded on a corner-stone*? Here is demonstrative proof that the passage is not to be literally interpreted. The words, evidently, are highly figurative, and purely symbolic. As well might we quote these words in refutation of Newton, and argue from them that the earth is not a round ball suspended in ether, but is a plane or cube propped by a great stone, as quote them in refutation of Swedenborg, and argue from them that angels were pre-existent to men. Their proper reference, no doubt, is, to the spiritual creation, or the regeneration of man: they may, however, be taken as a general figurative description even of the natural creation. Then, by the *corner-stone* on which are fastened the foundations of the earth, we evidently must understand, not any material basis and fulcrum, but the unknown *power* by which the terraqueous globe is suspended in

* John vi. 70.

† Job xxxviii. 6, 7.

space. In the same manner, by the *sons of God* cannot be meant any personal beings, but *the heavenly worlds*; that is, the interior or spiritual spheres of creation, constituting the kingdom prepared for the saints from the foundation of the world. As the production of the material universe was the middle end of creation, with a view to the existence of man and thence to the peopling of the heavenly worlds, which is the final end of creation; therefore, by a beautiful figure, the heavenly worlds, personified as the sons of God, may well be said to have shouted for joy when the earth came into existence.

But if any cannot relinquish the notion of angels shouting at the creation of the world; let them confine their idea, as they always do, to the creation of *this* world; and it cannot be denied that the fact is possible enough. This world is reckoned to have existed about six thousand years; which, as to its human inhabitants, is probably its true age: but that other worlds existed, and angels from them, myriads and myriads of years before, cannot be doubted. Philosophers assure us, that some of the stars discovered by the telescope are so remote, that the light emitted from them, traveling with its known prodigious speed, would be hundreds of thousands of years in reaching our world: it has reached us, however, or we could not see them; hence, in the circumstance of their being visible to us, we have sensible demonstration, that they have been for hundreds of thousands of years in existence. Consequently, if it must be believed that angels were literally present, shouting for joy at the production of our earth, there were worlds in abundance to supply them, without our having recourse to the fiction of angels created such in the ethereal regions.

The above texts fail, it is plain, to support the notions for which they are quoted: but a stronger reason remains, which is thus stated by the writer under review. "Besides what is already advanced," he modestly says, "there is one special argument which might puzzle even a Swedenborgian; and which is comprehended in the temptation and fall of our first parents. Now Baron Swedenborg himself allows that the serpent tempted Eve; and all reasonable people are decidedly of opinion that the devil was in the serpent, and actuated and influenced him during the whole of the temptation. The question then is, 'Where did this devil come from, seeing that no one had ever died up to this time?' And if no one had died, then there must have been a devil who was not the spirit of a departed wicked man."*

To frame this "special argument," the writer assigns a notion to Swedenborg which he knows that enlightened character

did not hold ; and the premises being still too narrow, he ekes them out with a gratuitous assumption. He makes Swedenborg allow that the serpent tempted Eve ; and yet he afterwards adduces, as specimens of that writer's commentaries on Genesis, extracts from his explanation of the second and fifth chapters, in which the whole history of Adam and Eve, and their immediate posterity, is shown to be a pure allegory ! So, he affirms that all reasonable people believe that the devil, meaning a certain personal being, was in the serpent ; though neither Moses nor any other inspired writer belonged to the class of such reasonable people, for none of them give any intimation of such belief. John the Revelator indeed informs us, not that the devil was *in* him, but that the old serpent *was* the devil : but how is this consistent with the idea of a personal devil, when Moses assures us that this serpent was one of the "beasts of the field ?" Indeed, the history is so palpably a pure allegory, that it is truly astonishing how any can continue to bind their notion to the literal relation. If the serpent either was the devil in person, or had the devil in him, how came the punishment of the temptation to fall upon the race of common serpents ? Why were they condemned to go upon their belly, and to eat dust, (which latter command, by the by, they have not obeyed), while no punishment whatever is denounced on the real culprit ? Well might Milton's Satan (to whom he often gives more rational ideas than belong to the theologians who frame their doctrines from the literal sense of an allegory) ridicule the whole transaction, and the application of the punishment to the wrong victim : "Man," he says,

"by our exile
 Made happy ; him by fraud I have seduced
 From his Creator ; and the more to increase
 Your wonder, with an apple ! He thereat
 Offended (worth your laughter) hath given up
 Both his beloved man and all his world
 To sin and death a prey : —
 True is, me also he hath judged : *or rather*
Not me but the brute serpent, in whose shape
 Man I deceived."

Thus the belief that any personal devil was the agent in this transaction is beset with irreconcilable inconsistencies. But consider "all the beasts of the field" to be types of all the affections that have place in the natural part of man, and the serpent to denote that part of the human constitution which is the seat of the sensual conceptions and carnal appetites, and which, when separated from the higher faculties, is so truly depicted by the serpent under the curse, — going upon its belly, and eating dust ; and we have a view of the subject which re-

moves all difficulty, and reads a lesson of instruction most important and impressive.

The "special argument" has, however, another horn to it: let us see whether that is any more formidable than the former. "On the other hand," proceeds its author, "I find it plainly recorded, that there were good angels, before any one, good or bad, had died, as the following passage will show. 'Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. So he drove out the man: and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden *cherubims* and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life!' (Gen. iii. 23, 24). Now, if, devils and angels are none other than the departed spirits of men, as Baron Swedenborg would teach us to believe, then I demand of those whom it behoves to answer, whence came the devil that tempted Eve, and those '*cherubims*' who were placed at the gate of Eden with a flaming sword, seeing no one had ever died up to that time?'"* In regard to "the devil that tempted Eve," the "demand" has already been complied with: but before we comply with that part of it which relates to the *cherubims*, we would humbly request to have it proved, that "*cherubims*" are angels.

In the most holy place in the tabernacle and temple, upon the covering of the ark, were placed two cherubim: can we suppose that an image representing a mere created nature could have been allowed to such a station? The only part of the cherubim made by Moses of which any description is given, is their wings, which reached quite across from one side of the most holy place to the other, but we never read that angels have wings; they owe that appendage to the pure benevolence of their painters. But the most particular description of cherubim is in the magnificent vision seen by Ezekiel, chs. i. and x. He beheld "the likeness of four living creatures. And this was their appearance: They had every one the likeness of a man: and every one had four faces: and every one had four wings. And their feet were straight feet: the sole of their foot was like a calf's foot: and they sparkled like the color of burnished brass. And they had the hands of a man under their wings on their four sides.—And as for the likeness of their faces, they four had the face of a man, and the face of a lion, on their right side; and they four had the face of an ox on the left side; they four also had the face of an eagle.—As for the likeness of the living creatures, their appearance was like burning coals of fire, and like the appearance of lamps; it went up and down among the living creatures. And the fire was

* Pp. 64, 65.

bright; and out of the fire went forth lightning. And the living creatures ran and returned as the appearance of a flash of lightning.”* Connected with these living creatures were four wonderful wheels, “full of eyes round about.” “And when the living creatures went, the wheels went by them: and when the living creatures were lifted up from the earth, the wheels were lifted up:—for the spirit of the living creatures was in the wheels.” “And when they went, I heard the noise of their wings, like the noise of great waters, as the voice of the Almighty.”† “This is the living creature that I saw under the God of Israel by the river of Chebar: and I knew that they were the cherubims.”‡ Now who can suppose that these wonderful creatures, which never are called angels, in fact are angels? Angels, as the name implies, are *sent* on divine messages: but cherubim are not described as sent forth *from* the Almighty, but as *accompanying* the Almighty,—as being, in fact, his chariot. Hence they had wheels under them, and upon their head was a firmament or expanded plane, and over the firmament was a throne, on which the Divine Being sat:§ And hence it is explicitly said of Jehovah, that “he rode upon a cherub, and did fly.”|| Can a cherub, on which Jehovah, in any sense, can be said to ride and fly, be a created angel? The idea is monstrous; it is absolutely profane. How plain is it then that cherubim cannot be independently existing beings of any kind! The appearances called such, are representative forms, imaging the sphere of Divine Truth which emanates from the Lord. This, on the one hand, forms a guard, preventing the too near approach of those who would be injured were they allowed to enter more interiorly into holy things than their proper state will permit; which is meant by their guarding the tree of life from being profaned by fallen Adam, and also by their forming a covering over the ark; and on the other hand, it is the medium by which the Lord communicates instruction, or imparts understanding, to men and angels; which is what is meant when riding and flying are predicated of him.

The above appears to me to be a true and satisfactory explanation of the cherubim, whenever they are mentioned. But even if cherubim be ever named to signify created angels, there is no difficulty in conceiving how some of these might be posted at the gate of Eden, after Adam’s ejection. For the whole history of Adam and Eve, we have already seen, is a pure allegory. By Adam is not meant an individual man, but the first church that existed on this globe, comprising many generations of individual men. All of these who were translated into the

* Ch. i. 5—8, 10, 13, 14.

† Ver. 18, 19, 20, 24.

‡ Ch. x. 20.

§ Ch. i. 22, 26, 27, 28.

|| Ps. xviii. 10.

spiritual world while the church stood in its purity, of course became angels: and it is sufficiently probable that these, also, might act as guards, to prevent their degenerate successors from incurring the profanation, which would have been represented by fallen Adam's re-entering the garden, and again eating of the tree of life. That, at the period in question, there were angels in heaven who had come into existence as men on this earth, cannot be doubted.*

I trust that the futility, in every respect, of the arguments adduced against Swedenborg's statements on this subject, may now be apparent, and that every candid reader will see, that, while abundant consideration may be produced, both from reason and Scripture, evincing that angels are of the same species, — of the same origin, as men, nothing can justly be urged from either source in proof of their diversity.

SECTION VI.

HEAVEN AND HELL; AND THE APPEARANCES IN THEM, AND IN THE INTERMEDIATE REGION, OR WORLD OF SPIRITS.

PART III.

All Swedenborg's statements respecting the Spiritual World are perfectly Reasonable and Scriptural, when certain Truths, relating to that World, are known.

In the *general* views which are presented in the writings of Swedenborg respecting Heaven and Hell, as the abodes, respectively, of happiness and misery, while there certainly is not any thing which is not in the highest degree agreeable to both Reason and Scripture, there also is nothing which can be deemed inconsistent with the usual conceptions of the Christian world. Such, at least is the case, if it be admitted, as we have just seen is the fact, that all the inhabitants of heaven and

* Nor, indeed, can it easily be doubted, what many writers have seen, that there was a race of beings whom *they* call Præ-Adamites; and it is abundantly probable, that the spirits of these may occupy a sphere so near to the Divine, as to be in a manner swallowed up in it, so as to retain no consciousness of existence separate from the Divinity, beyond what may be supposed of the "four beasts" or animals which "rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come!" [Rev. iv. 8].

hell strictly belong to the human race, having first come into existence as men in a natural world.

But my aim in this Appeal is, to recommend our views of the eternal world and state, and our doctrines of faith and life, not so much by the direct presentation of their obvious beauties, as by the vindication of those points which have been most assailed by objectors, because they most differ from the common apprehensions of the Christian world. Now some of the particulars brought to light in the writings of Swedenborg respecting Heaven, Hell, and the Intermediate Region or World of Spirits, — some of the circumstances relating to their inhabitants, and to the appearances which are there presented to the view, — certainly do widely differ from the commonly received apprehensions. It is by these, then, that our adversaries chiefly hope to make an unfavorable impression on their readers; with which view they set them forth in an isolated manner, separate from the explanations of their causes which the Author gives in various parts of his works. When the causes are seen, though they do not bring the statements objected to nearer to the common apprehensions, they evince the common apprehensions to be founded in mistake, and establish the agreement of all the Author's statements with Reason and Scripture. The explanatory truths, then, necessary to the right understanding of the subject, I propose here to offer; and nothing more will be necessary for the vindication of every relation which our adversaries would stigmatize as unfounded or ridiculous.

A great change must be made in our ideas respecting the other world in general, when we have got rid of the notion of angels created such, and of some of them falling out of heaven and becoming the original devils. When we conceive of angels as men, freed from the imperfections which adhered to them when here, and exalted to the highest degrees of human perfection; and of infernals as men in the deepest extremes of degradation, deprived of all outward good and rationality, thus of every thing properly human, but yet retaining a relation to what is human though in complete perversion; our ideas as to what is likely to take place in the other life must be very much altered from what they are, while we dream of the inhabitants of the eternal world as chiefly consisting of a class of beings of whose real nature we know nothing at all, but only imagine it to be something immensely superior to the nature of mankind. In addition, then, to the great truth, that all angels and spirits began their existence as men in the world, only two other general truths are necessary to be known, in order to see the reasonableness and Scripture ground of the seemingly most extraordinary of the particulars stated by Swe-

denborg respecting the inhabitants of heaven, hell, and the spiritual world in general, and the objects and appearances which there exist. These two general truths are, **FIRST**, *That man after death, though no longer clothed with a material body, is no less a real and substantial man than before*: and **SECONDLY**, *That all things which exist before the sight in heaven, hell, and the intermediate state or region, are appearances, expressing and outwardly exhibiting, according to the laws of the immutable analogy or correspondence that exists by creation between spiritual things and natural, the state, ideas, and inclinations, of those who dwell there.*

I. With respect to the *first* of these general truths, — *That man after death, though no longer clothed with a material body, is no less a real and substantial man than before*, — sufficient proof, I apprehend, to satisfy any mind open to conviction, may have been given above in our Section on the Resurrection: where we found that the Apostle Paul expressly teaches, that there is a spiritual body as well as a natural body; and where it was shown that all the testimony of Scripture upon the subject treats this spiritual body as the man himself, — as a real substantial existence, which rises in eternity immediately after death. As, however, Swedenborg's account of this matter has been quoted as ridiculous,* I will adduce the paragraph in which he states the difference between man in the other world and man in this, and leave the candid to judge, whether, instead of its being ridiculous, it is not rational in the highest degree. His words are, "The difference between a man in the natural world, and a man in the spiritual world, is, that the latter is a man clothed with a substantial† body, but the former with a material body, within which is his substantial body; and a substantial man sees a substantial man as clearly and distinctly as a material man sees a material man; a substantial man, however, cannot see a material man, nor can a material man see a substantial man, by reason of the difference between what is material and what is substantial, the nature of which difference may be described, but not in a few words."‡

Now, that this is the true representation of the matter, may be Scripturally proved from all the accounts of the visions of

* Anti-Swedenborg, p. 123.

† The author uses the terms *substantial* and *substance*, in the logical sense of *that which subsists by itself and sustains accidents*; but he confines it to spiritual subsistences as distinct from material, because the latter do not exist of themselves, but from the former; as do these from the Lord, who is the veriest substantial Being of all.

‡ True Christian Religion, n. 793.

the prophets. Did John the Revelator see the wonderful things that he describes with the eyes of his body? Does he not begin his revelations with saying, "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day?"* In this state it was that he first heard behind him "a great voice as of a trumpet" and that, on turning round, he "saw seven golden candlesticks, and in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like unto the Son of man."† When he was *in the spirit*, he was in his *spiritual or substantial man*, and it was with the eyes and senses of this that he witnessed all that he afterwards describes.

That this idea is as agreeable to reason as to Scripture, is evident from the opinions of many intelligent and pious persons, who have been convinced of its truth by their own reflections. I will mention here one testimony of this sort: it is that of Mrs. Fletcher, the widow of the Rev. Mr. Fletcher, the sentiments of both of whom respecting Swedenborg have been noticed above.‡

The life of Mrs. Fletcher, published from her own papers, has been very extensively read among religious people: and in it this intelligent and excellent lady gives her views of the state of man after death. She entertained the full belief, that, though separated from her husband, so far as death could separate, her union and communion with him still remained; and she thus expresses her ideas, in answer to objections made to them, partly in the very language of Swedenborg. "Is not [the objector is supposed to ask] the spirit, divested of the body, become of a quite different nature to what it was before, so as to be incapable of the same feelings? I answer, Certainly *no*: the spirit is the *man*. The spirit of my dear husband loved and cared for me, and longed above every other desire for my spiritual advancement. Now if it were the body, why doth it not love me still? You answer, Because it is dead. That is to say, the spirit is gone from it: therefore, that which loved me is gone from it. And what is that but the spirit, which actuated the body, as the clock-work does the hand which tells the hour? It therefore appears quite clear to me, that every right affection, sentiment, and feeling of mind, we have been exercised in here, will remain in the spirit, just the same, *immediately after death*."§ Now if many believe this to be true when

* Rev. i. 10.

† Ver. 10, 12, 13.

‡ Pp. 251—256.

§ P. 195, 8vo. ed. 1818. It has been shown above, p. 274, that, after her husband's decease, Mrs. F. consulted the Treatise on heaven and Hell, to see the account there given of the world to which he was gone. This explains, what otherwise would be truly extraordinary, the co-incidence, not only as to ideas, but as to expressions, between Mrs. F., in the passage above, and Swedenborg. It is quite plain that she fully accepted his sentiments on the subject.

they read it in Mrs. Fletcher, why do they deride Swedenborg as an enthusiast for saying the very same thing? Our opponents will say, "Because she gives it only as her opinion: he delivers it as a truth which he could testify from experience." This does not make it less true, at any rate. But I may add, that Mrs. F. also gives us experience on the subject, both of her own and others, of which I extract the following, which she relates* as an indubitable fact, of a woman whom she calls "that dear old saint, Mary Mathews."

This good woman having awaked under an extraordinary influence early in the morning, on getting up and coming down stairs, relates what happened to her thus: "All around me seemed God! It appeared to me as if the room was full of heavenly spirits. — Falling back in my chair, I remembered no more of any thing outward, but thought I was at the threshold of a most beautiful place. I could just look in: — The first thing I saw was the Lord Jesus sitting on a throne. There was a beautiful crown over his head. It did not seem to bear with a weight, but as if it was suspended there, and as he turned his head it turned with him. A glorious light appeared on one side, and all around him was glory! I thought of that word of St. Paul, — Who dwelleth in light unapproachable. Turning my eyes a little, I saw close to my Saviour my dear minister Mr. Fletcher. He looked continually on the Lord Jesus with a sweet smile. But he had a very different appearance from what he had in the body, and yet there was such an exact resemblance, that I could have known him among a thousand. Features and limbs just the same, but not of flesh. It was what I cannot describe, all light! I know not what to call it: I never saw any thing like it. It was, I thought, such a body as could go thousands of miles in a moment. There were several passed who had the same appearance: and I seemed to have lost my old weak shaking body. I seemed to myself as if I could have gone to the world's end, as light as air. I looked on him a long time, and observed every feature with its old likeness. He then turned his eyes on me, and held out his hand to me, just as he used to do. After this, the whole disappeared, and I came to myself." — I offer no opinion of this vision; but I suppose that all the people called Methodists, and most pious persons, will admit it to have been something real. Yet here we have an account of man's retaining his identity after death, and existing in a spiritual and yet substantial body, that exactly accords with the statements given by Swedenborg.

Are we not then entitled to say, that, according to the evi-

* P. 227.

dence of Scripture, the conclusions of the intelligent, and the experience of the pious, the testimony of Swedenborg, upon this subject, is most certainly true? Man after death is still a man, — a real man in a substantial yet spiritual body, though no longer in a material body, as while here.

II. We proceed to the *second* general truth necessary to our seeing the reasonableness and Scripture-ground of the particular facts respecting the appearances in the other world which are stated by Swedenborg. That general truth is, *That all things which exist before the sight in heaven, hell, and the intermediate state or region, are appearances, expressing, and outwardly exhibiting, according to the laws of the immutable analogy of correspondence that exists by creation between spiritual things and natural, the state, ideas, and inclinations, of those who dwell there.*

It is a fact which was well known in ancient times, though it has long been lost sight of, that there does exist, by the very first laws of nature and creation, a constant mutual relation between spiritual things, or such as relate to the mind and its perceptions, and the objects which appear in outward nature; which is such, that natural things answer to spiritual by an unalterable, fixed, and most exact analogy or correspondence, so that in every natural object an image of some spiritual thing or principle is to be seen. Thus, who does not know, without any one to inform him, that light is an exact image of truth; darkness, of ignorance and falsehood; fire, of love? And if some natural things thus clearly answer to certain spiritual things, who can doubt that all natural things do the same, and that such correspondence is essential to their nature? * Now in heaven and hell there cannot be any really *natural* things; but instead of the things themselves there are appearances of them, and such as exactly answer to the state, ideas, and inclinations of those around whom they appear. Hence, many of those things which appear as real to the wicked, have no existence but in their own phantasy, and are mere illusions of their sensual imaginations. An idea of this may be formed from the case of insane persons, and of such as labor under extremely severe nervous disorders, in the world: These, as is well known, will often imagine that they see and are annoyed by different appearances, and even experience severe pains in the body, when the whole is the mere illusion of the imagination.

* See this proved in the work on the Plenary Inspiration of the Scriptures. See it shown also in Kirby and Spence's *Introduction to Entymology*, Vol. i. pp. 11, 12, 22, 23, Vol. iv. pp. 401—410; or see the *Intellectual Repository*, for April, 1826, p. 131, &c.; where the passages are extracted.

though its effects to them are the same as of the most solid reality. Now all in hell are absolutely insane. Rationality can never exist in a state of separation from goodness and truth. In its genuine state, it is the offspring of the heavenly marriage of those two principles. In the world, men, even though wicked, are kept in some outward regard to the principles of goodness and truth for the sake of their characters in society, and also are held in a state of rationality by the Lord, that their reformation may be possible: but such rationality does not reach to their internal part or spirit, when the truly internal man, — the apostle's "inward man which delights in the law of God," — is closed: it is put off at death together with their external part; and as they then come into their internal, which is in the infernal marriage of evil and falsehood, they become also actually insane; although, as is often the case with the insane in this world, they become in the highest degree cunning, and skillful in malicious artifices.

Now that the objects which appear to sight in the spiritual world are appearances of such objects as are seen in the natural world, and that these are all representative of spiritual things, is perfectly evident from all the relations of the kind which are to be found in the Word of God, and which are there very numerous. To take an example which alone is sufficient to establish the fact.

When forces were sent to seize Elisha the prophet, and his servant was greatly intimidated at the danger, we read thus: "And Elisha prayed and said, Lord, I pray thee open his eyes that he may see: And the Lord opened the eyes of the young man, and he saw: and behold, the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha."* Here were appearances of objects similar to those of the natural world, seen when the eyes of the spirit of Elisha's servant were opened: consequently, the objects seen were really in the spiritual world, and not in the natural world. But who can imagine that there are real horses and real chariots in heaven or in any part of the spiritual world? What then were these but appearances representative of the sphere of Divine Protection with which the prophet was surrounded? The prophet, doubtless, being the immediate agent of God, was in consociation with the angelic world, and in the midst, as to his spirit, of guardian angels: but his servant did not see the angels themselves, but appearances representative of the defence and protection, which by the ministry of angels, surrounded him from the Lord.

A hundred other instances might be mentioned, but I will confine myself to a few. We read in Zechariah, That he saw

* 2 Ks. vi. 17.

a man riding on a red horse among the myrtle trees, behind whom were red horses, speckled, and white : that he afterwards saw four horses presented before him : that he saw a man with a measuring line in his hand : that he saw a golden candlestick and two olive trees : that he saw an ephah, or a sort of a measure, flying in the air, and a woman sitting in the midst of the ephah ; and that he saw two other women with the wings of a stork, who lifted up the ephah between the earth and heaven ;* with many other things equally extraordinary. These he could not see with the eyes of his body : they were, then, things presented before the eyes of his spirit : thus they were appearances of things in the spiritual world : and that they all were representative of some spiritual subject, no one, surely, can doubt. Just the same was the case with John when he wrote the Revelation. We have already seen, that when he beheld the extraordinary things that were exhibited before him, he was *in the spirit*, or in a state in which the senses of his spirit were opened : and that all the singular and wonderful appearances which he afterwards beheld were representations of spiritual subjects, and of the interior state of the things and persons to whom they related, no reflecting mind can doubt for a moment.~ Thus, for instance, when he was favored with a sight of the Lord as the Son of man : who can doubt that all the appearances which his divine person exhibited were exact correspondences of his divine attributes and perfections ? for it is impossible to suppose that the person of the Lord, in itself, is such as is there described. Thus it is said of this Glorious Being, not only that “his head and his hairs were white like wool, as white as snow, and his eyes as a flame of fire, and his countenance as the sun shining in his strength ;” but also that “his feet were like fine brass as though they burned in a furnace, — that he had in his right hand seven stars, and that out of his mouth went a sharp two edged sword.”† These are beautiful representative appearances, — his face like the sun, of his divine love in its interior, higher, and inmost nature, as perceived by angels ; his feet like burning brass, of the same divine love in his Divine Natural Essence, whence he operates on men ; the stars in his hand, of all the divine principles of knowledge which he imparts to the church ; and the sword from his mouth, of the power and operation of his Word or Divine Truth. And who can doubt, if the circumstances under which the Lord himself appears to those who enjoy such a privilege are thus representative of his attributes and the excellences of his nature, that the circumstances in which all the inhabit-

* Ch. i. 8, 18 ; ii. 1 ; iv. 2, 3 ; v. 6, 7, 9.

† Rev. i. 14, 15, 16.

tants of the spiritual world find themselves, — whether in heaven, in hell, or in the intermediate state, are representative of their state, quality, and nature, likewise, and that all the appearances which attend them entirely depend on those circumstances? And yet that the appearances which there exist are not mere illusions, having no reality whatsoever, is evident from the occurrence, that a little book was presented both to Ezekiel and to John, and which was not only made manifest to their sight, but they were commanded to eat it; which they accordingly did, and both of them describe how it tasted. Ezekiel affirms, “I did eat it, and it was in my mouth as honey for sweetness:” * John says, “And I took the little book out of the angel’s hand, and ate it up; and it was in my mouth sweet as honey: and as soon as I had eaten it my belly was made bitter:” † — circumstances these, which fully prove, that the spirit, in which John and Ezekiel were, has its senses as well as the natural body: for that they could not eat a spiritual book with the organs of their natural body, is evident: the spiritual body only could eat a spiritual book or roll; and with their spiritual senses only could they distinguish its taste.

Evident, then, I apprehend, it is, that all things that exist in the spiritual world are appearances, which either are actually real, or appear as distinctly as if they were so to the senses of the inhabitants. If any one cannot believe that the things seen by the prophets had any proper reality, though they impressed their senses as such, we will not stop to dispute the point now: only I will assure him, that we believe all the appearances in the spiritual world described by Swedenborg to be of exactly the same kind: the one exist there as really as the other, and equally owe their origin to the spiritual things and states of which they are the outward manifestations. The only difference is, that the things seen by the prophets were appearances produced at the time by the Lord, to represent things and states belonging to the church and its members mostly at periods future to the time of the exhibition of the visions; whereas the appearances described by Swedenborg as ordinarily existing in heaven, hell, and the intermediate world, are those which constantly flow from the states of the angels, spirits, or infernals, about whom they are seen.

Plain enough, then, I apprehend, is the agreement of our author’s assertions on this subject with the testimony of Scripture. And that it is equally agreeable to the suggestions of reason, is evident from the fact, that never did any one endeavor from his imagination to draw a picture, presenting any thing in de

* Ezek. iii. 3.

† Rev. x. 10.

tail, of heaven or hell or their inhabitants, without accompanying it with such circumstances as he deemed expressive of the states of mind of those whom he wished to depict: the only difference being, that persons who have formed their guesses from their imagination, being ignorant of the true correspondences or analogies between natural things and spiritual, have usually been very much mistaken as to the particulars of their figurative delineations. Many writers, also, have seen, that unless the objects that appear in heaven be analogous to those which are found on earth, our idea of heaven is an idea of a mere nothing. Thus the angel Raphael is made to say, in Milton's *Paradise Lost*,

—“What surmounts the reach
Of human sense, I shall delineate so,
By likening spiritual to corporeal forms,
As may express them best: though *what if earth*
Be but the shadow of heaven, and things therein
Each to other like, more than on earth is thought.”*

In which striking lines he has exactly delineated the true state of the case. Be it asked then; Is it reasonable to condemn Swedenborg for affirming as a fact, what in Milton we admire as a highly probable conjecture? So likewise, I am assured, even one of our accusers has himself seen the necessity of finding some other objects wherewith to furnish heaven, beside men in their revived material bodies; whence he once preached a sermon to prove, that there would be a resurrection of animals as well as of human beings; an idea which is favored, also, by the great Bishop Butler: and surely to put there horses and oxen, sheep and goats, dogs and cats,—to consider beasts as existing in the spiritual world in solid bodies of animal flesh and blood,—is immensely more extravagant than our idea, that such things do indeed exist there, but only as appearances. So, I suppose, every Methodist knows, that Mr. Wesley furnishes his new earth, which he considers to be the habitation of the saints in glory, with all kinds of animals and other objects which exist in this earth, only in a much more perfect state. But surely, since all seem to be sensible, that, in some way or other, that world must contain such objects, it is far more reasonable with us, to conclude, that such things exist there as appearances, not possessing any conscious life of their own, existing only as outward figures of the states of the human inhabitants, and appearing or disappearing as those states change, than to image with our opponents, that they exist there of themselves, real living creatures, enjoying for their own sakes the privilege of immortality. Reason teaches us, that the privi-

* B. v. 571, &c.

lege of immortality only accompanies the faculty of rationality, and the capacity of being conjoined to THE IMMORTAL by the conscious reception of his life-giving energies.

If then our two general positions are seen to be true ; if it be admitted that man after death, though no longer clothed with a material body, is a real and substantial man, — if good, endowed with the most exalted wisdom, and if wicked, though inexpressibly cunning, destitute of all true rationality and absolutely insane ; — and if it be seen that the things which exist in heaven, hell, and the intermediate world, are appearances, exhibiting sensibly the inward states of those about whom they are seen ; or if it be only known, what cannot be disputed, that this is the manner in which these subjects are represented in the writings of our Author and understood by us ; — we are provided with satisfactory solutions of all those circumstances in his accounts of the nature of the spiritual world, which naturally at first appear strange, and which may easily be made to appear ridiculous. Refer them to their interior causes, and all pretext for ridicule disappears.

SECTION VI.

HEAVEN AND HELL ; AND THE APPEARANCES IN THEM, AND
IN THE INTERMEDIATE REGION, OR WORLD OF SPIRITS.

PART IV.

*The Existence of the Marriage-Union in Heaven, and of an
Opposite Connection in Hell.*

THEOLOGIANS having assumed that the eternal world is peopled by a class of beings, as its principal and primitive inhabitants, created originally as angels ; and so created, too, independently of each other, — all, at once, immediately produced from the hand of the Creator, and none through the instrumentality of others as their parents, according to the order of the production of all the races of living beings, without exception, with which we possess any actual acquaintance ; having thus excluded the distinction of sex, or anything analogous to it, from the original order of angelic beings ; they have deemed it necessary, however awkwardly, to deprive of that distinction, when drafted into the angelic ranks, the recruits drawn from the race of rational creatures on earth, though they came into

existence here as both men and women. But when it is seen that this order of original angels, neither male nor female, is the pure creation of man, not of God ; that, in reality, there is not a single angel in heaven, nor a single devil in hell, nor a single created inhabitant of the spiritual world, of whatsoever character, but what first came into being as a man or a woman in the natural region of creation ; it becomes a matter of extreme difficulty to imagine, that on being transplanted into the spiritual world, they cease to be men and women, and to be connected with each other in that relation, altogether. And when, in addition to the fact, that all the inhabitants of the spiritual world are from the human race, it is seen, as we have just proved, that man after death is no less a real and substantial man than before ; and when it is further seen, as also just proved, that all things which exist before the sight, in the other world, are appearances, outwardly exhibiting the state, ideas, and inclinations, of those who dwell there ; it seems scarcely possible to doubt, that they who have been men and women in this world will still be, respectively, men and women in that ; and, consequently, that there must exist pure marriage-unions in heaven, and connections of an opposite nature in hell.

This idea, however, as represented in the writings of the illustrious Swedenborg, is amongst those, against which the most violent effusions of ridicule and scorn have been directed. We will therefore here invite the Candid and Reflecting to consider, whether these outpourings of revilement are made with reason, or without.

“ It is an evil and adulterous generation,” the greatest of authorities has said, “ which seeketh a sign :” and, assuredly it is only such a generation that could rail against the idea, of the existence of a pure Marriage-Union in heaven, and of an Opposite Connection in hell.

1. Certainly among the symptoms of corruption of manners and grossness of sentiment which are so general in the present day, there is none more conspicuous and glaring, than the low ideas, which we almost everywhere meet with, of the nature and obligation of the conjugal covenant. Everything that is found in the Scriptures on this important subject, constantly adverts to the Marriage-Union as a thing most pure, most holy, most heavenly ; insomuch that, under the image of it, heaven itself is represented to us in the Word of God ; yea, by this, as the only symbol worthy of the subject, is in the Sacred Records depicted the conjunction of God with the human race. On the other hand, a state of adultery is in the same Divine Word constantly spoken of as justly representing, and accurately exhibiting to our apprehension, man’s infidelity to his Maker,— the

state and nature of hell itself. Evidently then, in the Divine Mind, two more direct opposites do not exist, than the lawful and unlawful connection of the sexes: Yet who is to be found, among the general bulk of society, who in his own mind views the difference as so fundamental and irreconcilable? Who considers the true love of marriage to be essentially holy, and the love of all connections alien therefrom essentially profane? Who regards the difference between them as intrinsically inherent in the things themselves, independently of all merely arbitrary appointment? It is true that few persons conceive that there is no difference whatever between the one and the other: the utility of marriage in society is too obvious to allow any but the most desperately profligate to maintain, that the violation of its bonds is altogether a matter of indifference, or that libertine practices are free from criminality: but who supposes that the love of the one species of connection and that of the other are two perfect opposites, and that the pleasures they afford to their respective votaries are essentially different, having in reality nothing whatever in common? How many are there, in fact, who look upon marriage as but a sort of legalized adultery, and upon adultery as differing in nothing but the want of the legal sanction from marriage! Hence it is that, among the topics of revilement brought forward against the doctrines of the New Jerusalem, none is more frequently insisted on, none is more confided in, as capable of exposing them to utter derision and contempt, than this: that those doctrines affirm true marriage to be a permanent institution, true marriages to be indissoluble, even by the power of the grave; and that in regard to all who enter the heavenly kingdom, should circumstances have prevented them from finding proper partners here, they will find such there, with whom their union continually becomes more perfect, and more fraught with pure delight, through eternity. What is the law of Divine Order upon this subject, proclaimed at the beginning of creation, and confirmed most solemnly by the Lord Jesus Christ? "Have ye not read, that he which made them in the beginning made them a* male and a* female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore," says the Divine Comforter of this original divine law, "they are no more twain, but one flesh."† Yet because we believe this doubly authenticated statement of the Word of God; and because we believe that Jesus Christ uttered a law of eternal obligation, and spoke the plain truth, when he sealed the whole with the irreversible decree, "What

* Scholars allow that this is the proper translation.

† Matt. xix. 4, 5, 6.

therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder ;” we are ridiculed and reviled as giving gross ideas of heaven : Whereas all the grossness is in the minds of our accusers, many of whom it is plain, cannot form a pure thought of so sacred an institution as that of marriage ; who clearly betray, by their sneers respecting it, that in the thoughts of their hearts they think it essentially the same as any impure connection ; and who thence conclude, that to regard its chaste endearments to be perpetual, is to carnalize heaven. The same parties think, it appears, that though adultery is sinful, it nevertheless is very delightful, and that to represent it as taking place in hell, is to render hell irresistibly inviting. Thus one of them actually has affirmed, that our doctrines make heaven not much better than this world, and hell not much worse. He would have us believe, that marriage is not only not a holy, but not a happy state, insomuch that to be eternally tied to a wife is enough to render heaven not over delightful ; whilst to have the privilege of *keeping a harlot* (such is his phraseology, which includes, as we shall see in the sequel, a gross misrepresentation), is, as he represents it, so great a happiness, as to make hell itself a place of comfort ; whence (such is his decent language), “ our paupers might go to hell on speculation, with some prospect of advantage !” * So possessed is this writer with the notion, that to live with a harlot must be so delightful as amply to outweigh all other miseries, that he turns to it over and over again ; and others have treated the subject in the same style. The Candid and Reflecting, I am sure, will not envy our accusers their taste ; they will not think, that heaven, as described by Swedenborg, should be turned from without disgust, because its inhabitants live in the pure love of the conjugal covenant ; and that hell must be turned to with eagerness, because all who inhabit it are adulterers. I trust we shall all, presently, see reason to conclude, that heaven is really a place and state of holiness, as well as of happiness, though all chaste conjugal partners are there ; and that hell is a place and state of misery, as well as of wickedness, notwithstanding it is full of harlots and adulterers.

In the first place, then ; How is it possible to represent the holiness of the pure and chaste conjugal connection in a stronger light, than by describing, as the Scriptures do the Lord Himself as one of the parties in such a union, and the Church as the other ? Thus we find the Lord saying to the Church, “ Fear not, for thou shalt not be ashamed ; neither be thou confounded, for thou shalt not be put to shame : for thou shalt forget the shame of thy youth, and shalt not remember the reproach of

* Anti-Swedenborg. n. 68.

thy widowhood any more. For thy Maker is thy Husband ; the Lord of hosts is his name ; and thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel : the God of the whole earth shall be called.”* So we find the penitent Church saying in Hosea, “I will go and return to my first Husband ; for then it was better with me than now :”† upon which the Lord says a little below, “And it shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord, that thou shalt call me Ishi, and shall no more call me Baali :”‡ Baali means, “My Lord, or Master, and Ishi means, “My Husband.” The Lord says in Jeremiah respecting the church of the Israelites, “I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt ; which my covenant they brake, although I was a husband to them saith the Lord ?”§ Many such passages might be added. And as Jehovah, in the Old Testament, thus constantly speaks of himself as the husband of his Church, so is the Lord Jesus Christ, as being the manifested Jehovah, always mentioned in the New Testament in the same character, and he there claims the church as his bride and wife. “Can the children of the bridechamber mourn,” says he,|| “while the *bridegroom* is with them ?” in answer to the question why his disciples did not fast. So in the parable of the wise and foolish virgins, it is said,¶ that, while the *Bridegroom* tarried they all slumbered and slept ; and at midnight there was a cry made, Behold the *Bridegroom* cometh, go ye forth to meet him :” where, the *Bridegroom* is evidently the Lord Jesus Christ. But in how beautiful a manner is the marriage of the Lord with his Church, in that glorious state of it called the New Jerusalem, described in the Revelation ! “I, John, saw, the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a *bride* for her *husband*. — And there came unto me one of the seven angels which had the seven vials full of the seven last plagues, and talked with me, saying, Come hither, I will show thee the *bride*, the *Lamb’s wife*.”** And how truly sublime is the previous announcement of these nuptials ! “A voice came out of the throne, saying, Praise our God, all ye his servants, and ye that fear him, both small and great. And I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Allelujah, for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth. Let us be glad, and rejoice, and give honor to him, for *the marriage of the Lamb* is come, and *his wife* hath made herself ready. — And he saith unto me, Write : *Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage-supper of the Lamb*. And he saith unto me, These are the true sayings of God.”†† Are not these most

* Isa. liv. 4, 5. † Ch. ii. 7. ‡ Ver. 16. § Ch. xxxi. 32. || Mark. ii. 19.
¶ Matt. xxv. 5, 6. ** Ch. xxi. 2, 9. †† Ch. xix. 5, 6, 7, 9.†

magnificent, most beautiful, and most affecting representations, of the union of the Lord with his Church, and of the divine love from which he desires such a union? Is it not also certain; that the union of the Lord with his Church, is, next to the union of the Essential Divinity or Father with the Divine Humanity or Son, the most holy subject which is offered to the contemplation of man? Must not, then, that which is constantly taken to present it to our apprehension,—the marriage covenant,—be holy likewise? And, indeed, what could so properly represent this holy union of the Lord with his Church, as a union, of an inferior nature indeed, but which originates in, and flows down from, the higher union, and thus, as an effect from its cause, is the proper image for exhibiting it in view?

But not only does the Lord, both before the incarnation and since, design to describe himself as the Bridegroom and Husband of his Church, and his Church as his bride and wife, but he presents heaven itself to us under the idea of a marriage and describes admission into heaven as admission to a marriage. This is done in the last extract from the Revelation, and in several of the Lord's discourses. "The kingdom of heaven (saith he) is like unto a certain king which made *a marriage* for his son, and sent forth his servants to call them that were bidden to the wedding; and they would not come."* So likewise the wise virgins, being ready when the bridegroom came, "went in with him to the *marriage*;" which evidently means, were admitted into heaven. Here again we see the high honor done on every occasion by the Lord to the conjugal covenant. His first miracle† was wrought when he was present at a marriage as a guest; and he borrows the image of a marriage as the only one worthy to exhibit to his disciples the nature of his kingdom,—of heaven itself. Do I say, he borrows the image of a marriage to describe his kingdom? What if it be true that his kingdom is not only figurative, but positively and essentially, a marriage, and that what is called marriage among us is only a copy, a derivation, from that marriage which is heaven itself?

This will be seen to be the fact, by all who, rising above merely carnal ideas of the subject, duly consider the passages we have recited from the Word of God, and the numerous other testimonies pointing to the same truth with which the Word of God abounds, and look at the cause in which such statements are grounded.

For what can we imagine is the reason why the Lord Himself, even the eternal Jehovah, before his incarnation as well as

* Matt. xxii. 2, 3.

† John ii. 2, &c.

after it, thus delights to describe himself as the Husband and the Church as his wife? What can be the reason that he constantly exhibits his kingdom to us under the idea of a marriage? What can it be, but because the first and original marriage exists in his own essence; wherefore images of that marriage are thence derived through all the lower links of the great chain of existence, down to the last boundaries of created nature? Take an image of it as presented by the sun of this world, which is often referred to in Scripture as an image of the Lord, the sun of righteousness. Do we not well know that there must be two distinct principles which constitute the nature of that sun, because we evidently see and feel that two distinct things proceed from it, and testify their existence by their effects? Do not there proceed from the sun both heat and light? And do we not find that these may exist either separately (or at least in very unequal proportions) or together? In the season of winter the light is as bright, or nearly so, as in the middle of summer; yet because it is not united with heat, the earth is bound up with frost, and all the objects of the vegetable kingdom are in a state of torpidity and comparative death: but when the spring comes on, and the light is united with heat, all things bud and bloom, and nature celebrates the symbolic marriage by rejoicing through all her domains. Now light and heat existing in their first principles in, and thence proceeding from the sun of nature, are evident symbols of love or goodness and wisdom or truth existing in their first principles in, and thence proceeding from, the Lord Himself, the eternal source of all things. Fire or heat is the plain symbol of love; and every one that sees that light is the obvious symbol of truth; whence nothing is so common than to speak of *warmth of affection*, and of the *light of truth*. The apostle assures us in plain terms* that "God is love;" and Jesus Christ declarest that He is "the Light." Doubtless, then, these two principles exist in their source in God in the most perfect union; they unitedly constitute his essential nature: and both in him being infinite, their union must be infinitely perfect; there can be no disproportion between them; no preponderance of the one over the other. All that Infinite Love desires, Infinite Wisdom can direct and bring into effect; and all that Infinite Wisdom points to as desirable, Infinite Love can inspire and energize. Here then is marriage, in its first source. The union of love and wisdom in God is the truly divine marriage, and is essential to the very nature of Deity. From this divine, this thrice holy source, proceeds all that can justly be esteemed marriage in lower spheres; and in proportion as this is in them, all inferior unions, each in its degree, also are holy. Hence, likewise, there

* 1 John iv. 8.

† John viii. 12.

is something analogous to the male and female character even in inanimate things. Thus common perception teaches men to consider, with the poet, even the sun and moon as

“Communicating male and female light,”

and to deduce thence his general, sublime, and true assertion,

“Which two great sexes animate the world.”

From this marriage, then, of goodness or love and truth or wisdom in the Deity himself, next flows the heavenly marriage between the Lord and his Church ; which is effected when the church also receives, from the Lord, love and wisdom in union. The church has nothing belonging to her as a church, but what she receives from the Lord ; nevertheless, she first exists as an unbetrothed virgin, next as a bride, and finally as a wife. For although love and wisdom, as they exist in union in the Lord, proceed also in union from him, they are at once received in union by man. Man, being in evil, must first be instructed in divine truths, and thus be led in the path of repentance and reformation, before he can possibly be principled in that pure goodness to which all genuine truth points, and with which it desires to be conjoined. While then the church is in the affection of truth, but has not yet advanced to maturity in the appropriation of its practical tendency, she is what the Scripture calls a virgin : when she is matured by the application of her truths to life, and is in the ardent desire to be all that truth has opened to her conceptions, and thus to be united with the Lord, the Author both of her truth and her love, she is what the Scripture calls a bride : and when, accordingly, she receives the Lord as to the love or goodness of which he is the author, in the same degree that she receives the knowledge of his truth ; when, in the language of the divine epithalamium in Ps. xlv., she has completely *forsaken her own people and her father's house*, or rejected all the false and evil principles which adhere to her by nature ; then it is that her marriage is come, and that the Lord calls himself her husband, and owns her as his wife.

It is in this marriage, then, of goodness and truth, which is the same thing as the marriage of the Lord with the Church, that heaven essentially consists. None can be in heaven, but those with whom goodness and truth, thus perfectly united, form the life of their minds. With all the inhabitants of the blissful seats, love or goodness is the vital heat, truth or wisdom is the light that emanates from it, and forms as it were a clothing around it. Hence it is said of Jehovah himself, that he *covereth himself with light as with a garment*. To wear a *wedding garment*, then, according to the Scripture-phrase, is to be principled in genuine truth originating in genuine goodness ; or what is the same thing, to be principled in true faith ground-

ed in real charity : but not to have on a wedding-garment, is to hold the mere profession of faith without any charity ; in which case the faith also is not genuine, and cannot be endured in heaven, even should a hypocrite now and then, as appears, from the case of the man without a wedding-garment in the parable, to be not impossible, insinuate himself into that kingdom.

This view of the nature of the heavenly marriage must, it may be presumed, recommend itself to every one. No one can suppose that any man can be entertained in heaven, who is not principled in both the great heavenly graces of faith and charity ; and faith is truth really seen and believed, and charity is goodness really felt and loved. Each is essential to the perfection of the other, and without both, neither is genuine. How justly then is their union called a marriage ! And how evident it is that, in such a marriage, heaven must essentially consist,—that this lies at the source of all its perfections and beatitudes !

But it is certain that man could not be receptive either of goodness or truth, either of charity or faith, from the Lord, were he not created with faculties adapted for their entertainment. Accordingly, he has two great faculties in his mental constitution, of which all his mental powers are specific modifications ; which faculties are commonly denominated the will and the understanding ; the will being the seat of all man's desires and affections, and the understanding the seat of all his thoughts and ideas. The understanding can comprehend the truths of religion even while man is in an unregenerate state, — otherwise he never could become regenerate at all ; yet such truths are never agreeable to it while the will is in evil. But the will cannot love genuine goodness, except by regeneration ; although there may be amiable natural affections, such as those of good nature, in the will, by birth. The heavenly marriage, then, consists in the reception of goodness in the will as well as of truth in the understanding, and in the uniting into one of the will and understanding, in the acknowledgment, love, and service of the Lord : and it is by virtue of such marriage that the mind becomes replenished with heavenly graces through all its powers. New affections of goodness, and new perceptions of truth, then spring up in it every day ; which are a spiritual offspring, flowing from the union of goodness and truth in the inmost of the mind. And the whole is the result of the divine operation of the Lord, continually flowing into, and rendering fruitful, the goodness and truth in union which man has received from him : thus the whole of the spiritual births produced in the human mind are derived from the mar-

riage of the Lord and the Church; for which reason, also, the church is sometimes described in the Word as a mother; and all know that the Lord is the universal Father.

This then is the case with every one who becomes regenerate, whether man or woman. In all, the heavenly marriage takes place; and each, by virtue of it, becomes a member of the bride the Lamb's wife. I say, *a member* of the heavenly bride and wife, not *a* bride and wife, to guard against enthusiastic fancies, into which some, in various denominations, more particularly of the female sex, have fallen, in consequence of knowing from the Word that the Lord is called the Husband of the church, without having that correct apprehension of the subject which the doctrines of our church impart: for it is only to the church universal, considered as one body that in a strict sense, the Lord stands in the character of a Husband.

But in order that this heavenly marriage might exist in greater fulness, and thus that his divine love and wisdom, with their accompanying beatitudes, might be more fully received in heaven and in the church, the Lord has also been pleased so to form the human species, by creation, that two minds might likewise be capable of a similar intimate union, and thus become a real one, notwithstanding their abiding in two persons. The only means of effecting this, was, so to form the human race, as that in some minds affection might most decidedly predominate, and in others intellect: and who can deny that this constitutes the first distinction of the male and female character? The difference between the male and female exists quite as decidedly in their minds as in their outward forms; so that if it were possible to abolish all difference in the shape of their persons, this would by no means be sufficient to abolish all real distinction of sex. The sex is in the mind also, and can never be extirpated thence. On every subject whatsoever, one part of the species will ever think and feel as men, and the other as women. The minds, it is true, both of men and women, are constituted both of will and intellect, affection and intelligence: but who does not see that the man takes his distinguishing character from the predominating strength of his intellect, and woman hers from the predominating strength of her affections? Great disputes have been agitated on the question, Whether there is an inferiority on the part of females compared with men: but as, unfortunately, both parties have looked on intellect as the distinguishing faculty of the human race, and have overlooked, as of minor importance, the no less essential and valuable attributes of will and affection, men, in asserting their pre-eminence, have relied on the former alone, and female writers, with some auxiliary males, in denying the superiority,

have allowed the principle for which it is claimed to be the right criterion of it : hence, instead of making good their claim, as they might have done, had they only asserted a general equality, they have failed, through claiming an equality in the same principle of intellect. Intellect is not a more excellent attribute than affection ; and in affection, undoubtedly, the superiority is all on the side of the female sex. The sexes were thus endowed with equal but distinct excellences, that they might not engage in rivalry, but combine in union ; that female affection might both soften and exalt the intellect of the male, and that masculine intellect might guide and protect female affection. Affection without intellect is blind ; intellect without affection is dead : when united, intellect is quickened with life, affection rejoices in light. The female mind, however, is by no means destitute of intellect, nor the male destitute of affection : but who can look at both, and not allow that the two principles exist in the two in unequal proportions, so that one, only, forms, the predominating characteristic of each ? Hence it is that when a male and female mind really enter into interior union, which never can take place but where both are grounded in the heavenly marriage of goodness and truth, the perfection of each is immensely exalted, and with it the happiness ; each is a more perfect angel than either could be separately ; and the union of minds becomes so perfect, that before the Lord, by whom minds only are looked at, they become a one.

This then is that marriage which we affirm to be perpetual, and to exist in heaven : and is it not evidently founded in the very first principles of things, in the very first laws of nature ? — understanding by the laws of nature, those which determine the conditions of things, in the spiritual as well as in the material worlds, throughout the universe of creation. The marriage of goodness and truth which constitutes heaven is the immediate source of it : itself is a union of minds in which that prior marriage exists ; and the outward union is only a true marriage where there is the inner union also : without which, notwithstanding its having the sanction of the laws of men, it is an impure connection, tending more or less to the nature of adultery.

It is first of all, then, of the marriage of goodness and truth that the Lord speaks in the passage cited above, when he says that he which made them in the beginning made them a male and a female. By a male and a female, in a purely spiritual sense, are meant the principles of intellect and will, as formed for the reception of truth and goodness respectively ; the eternal law of order and of God respecting which is, that they should be united, and never be separated by the self-derived in-

telligence of man ; which is what He means when He says, "What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." Secondly, these words declare the perpetuity of such a union of male and female minds as originates in the marriage of goodness and truth. This is, in fact, the plain literal sense of the words : and of this marriage also the Divine Speaker authoritatively pronounces, "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder :"—as is done by those who deny the intrinsically holy nature of such marriage, and affirm that it must be put asunder forever by death. If it was not unworthy of the Paradise in which man was placed at creation, how should it be unworthy, when exalted to the same degree of purity as creation appointed for it, of the Paradise to which man is to be restored by redemption ? To accuse then a writer of impurity, because he restores the chaste love of marriage to the dignified station assigned it by the Creator, and confirmed by the Redeemer : vindicating its heavenly origin, and showing it to possess that perpetuity which every thing heavenly must inherently carry with it ; is a work only worthy of those whom the celebrated Milton denounces as hypocrites ;

"Whatever hypocrites austere talk
Of purity, and place, and innocence,
Defaming as impure what God declares
Pure." —*

So, in his beautiful apostrophe to wedded love, he says,

"Far be it I should write thee sin, or blame.
Or think thee unbefitting holiest place."†

It may with certainty be affirmed, that the more pure and heavenly any mind has been, the more has it been inclined to ascribe purity and perpetuity to this heavenly union. Thus the heavenly-minded Mrs. Fletcher, in pursuing her remarks on the continuance of her union with her deceased husband, from which an extract is made above,‡ expresses herself thus : "As spiritual union arises from a communication of the love which flows from the heart of Christ, I cannot but believe a nearer approach to its centre, and a fuller measure of that divine principle, must increase, and not diminish, the union between kindred souls ; and that their change will consist, not in the loss, but in the improvement of all good." — "Will not [it is asked] all particular unions cease ? and is it not the design of God that death should divide ? To answer this objection I must premise, that *what is of God shall stand*. I plead only for that union which has God for its source ; and I think it will not be hard to prove, that *what GOD hath joined together death*

* P. L. iv. 741, &c.

† Ib. 758, &c.

‡ P. 323.

cannot put asunder. Division comes not from God, but from the devil. God, both in his nature and works, is perfect unity ; and his original design for our first parents was not sorrow, consequently, not separation. — If we suppose their friendship was not to have been immortal, we must suppose pain to be in paradise : for Adam could not without pain inform Eve of such an awful secret, that, when they had praised God together for a certain time, they must eternally forget each other, — Or suppose he had said, Though we shall have a bare remembrance of each transaction, nevertheless, that *close union*, that endearing *oneness of soul*, of which the *love of God* was the foundation, — that very union hereafter the *love of God* is to dissolve ! This would indeed have been in itself exceeding bitter, and therefore never was the original design of love. It was sin that brought in separation. It was owing to the hardness of our hearts ; for in the beginning it was not so : *for God created one man and one woman.*” — She continues in the same strain for two or three pages further, in which she introduces this sentence of Swedenborg’s, “ Similitude joins, but dissimilitude separates.” * This was written soon after her husband’s death. Two years afterwards, she writes, “ I was led to reflect on my union with my dear husband. The question arose, What part of our union can heaven dissolve ? It will take away all that was painful ; such as our fears for each other’s safety, our separations, &c. But what of the pleasant part can heaven dissolve ! I answered from the bottom of my heart, Nothing, Lord, nothing ! Clear as light it appeared to me, that heaven could not dissolve any thing that agreed with its own nature. Let two drops of water, two flames of fire, or any two quantities of the same element be put together ; they would not destroy each other, but would be increased. So, what came down from God, would, when returned to its source, live for ever, and be corroborated, but not lessened. I am quite at a loss,” she adds, “ for words to describe the feelings of that hour ; but it fixed on my soul an assurance of our eternal union.” † And though she outlived her husband thirty years, her journal, till near the end, contains frequent repetitions of her conviction of the continuance of their union, and of her sense of it. ‡

Similar to the feelings of Mrs. Fletcher, in regard to the perpetuity of her union with her departed husband, were those of the pious Newton, rector of St. Mary, Woolnoth, in regard to his with his departed wife. In a poem on the subject, beautiful more for sentiment than expression, he says,

“ Shall one so favored e’er repine,
Or one so vile complain ?

* Pp. 203, 204.

† Pp. 236, 237.

‡ See pp. 255, 275, 364, 394.

No ! Let me praise ! She long was mine,
 And shall be mine again.
 If death could break our union past,
 Frail, though endeared the tie :
 The stronger band of love shall last,
 When death itself shall die."

And the inspirations of the Muse have dictated the same truths, even where the ordinary habits of the mind might be supposed to have closed it to a perception so heavenly : witness the following stanza of Byron's :

" There are two souls whose equal flow
 In gentle streams so calmly run,
 That when they part — they part — ah no !
 They cannot part — those souls are one."

What Scripture and reason thus dictate as to the perpetuity of the truly conjugal union, follows, also, from the *first* of the *general truths* we have established in the preceding PART of this SECTION. If man is a real man after death ; and if, as we have now seen, the origin of the distinction of sex is in the spirit ; it necessarily follows that human beings in the eternal world are male and female still ; and if so, that there are unions between them. It equally results from our *second general truth*, there also established. For if all the circumstances in which the angels are placed are representative of the state of their minds ; and if their minds are in the heavenly marriage of goodness and truth ; it follows, that they must be united by pairs in a marriage expressive of that within. Besides, what gloom and discomfort does the other supposition, when accurately looked at, introduce into our idea of heaven ! Who that has been tenderly and virtuously attached to a female, and has walked with her in the path to heaven, would not feel it a grievous blow to his happiness, should he find her, there, totally unlike the being he knew here ? Could there even be any perfect social happiness in a society consisting of all males, or all neuters ? Independently of its use in the continuance of the species, is not the division into sexes a most beneficent arrangement, immensely adding to the comforts, and harmonizing the intercourses, of the human race ? Is it not then reasonable to conclude, that this use of it will be perpetuated, where the former ceases ? And is it not the essence of reason to conclude, that a union in which, in its genuine state, is concentrated all that is heavenly on earth, — including a love which prefers another's welfare to its own, and a joy which nothing but such a love can inspire, — must, when exalted to its highest perfection, be among the highest beatitudes of heaven itself ?

Now to these purely heavenly ideas of the perpetuity of the

truly conjugal union, what plausible consideration can be opposed? Our accusers, because they have purely Sadducean notions of marriage to accompany their half Sadducean notions of the resurrection,—whence, like the Sadducees in the gospel, they “do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God,”—think they find a contradiction to these sentiments in the Lord’s answer to the Sadducees, denying the existence of *their sort of marriage* in heaven. The Sadducees asked, whose wife a woman that had seven husbands should be in the resurrection. To whom Jesus answered, “Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God. For, in the resurrection, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven.”* In the term “resurrection,” it is to be observed, is not usually included, “the resurrection of damnation,” but simply, “the resurrection of life,” that this is the heavenly state; hence it is said that they are “as the angels of God in heaven:” and to the truth of the answer, thus limited, most unquestionably, no exception can be made. It is true that there are no such merely carnal connections as the Sadducees spoke of, which it is a degradation of the name to call marriages, in heaven at all: there can be no such thing there as the transferring of a woman from one man to another, nor any such connection as such transfer implies: but it does not hence follow that there are in heaven no marriages which have for their essence that marriage of goodness and truth, which is the essence of heaven itself. It is also true, that the marriage of goodness and truth, if not commenced on earth, cannot be originated after death. It is in this world that charity must be joined with faith, and both with the Lord: otherwise this never can be done hereafter. But though this truth might yield a sufficient solution of the difficulty, it does not appear to be to the marriage of goodness and truth, nor to any unions originating therein, that the passage specifically relates. It appears evident from the phraseology used in this answer to the Sadducees, compared with that of the answer, already considered, to the Pharisees, that the marriage here spoken of is the opposite of the other,—the marriage of evil and falsehood, and such outward marriage as have this for their essence; and not the marriage of goodness and truth, and such outward marriages as draw their essence thence. For in the answer to the Pharisees, the Lord is mentioned as the author of the union.—“What God hath joined together;” but in this to the Sadducees, the marriages spoken of are those which proceed from the mere self-will of man, without being in any way referred to God at all,—“*they* neither marry,”—as men

* Matt. xxii. 29, 30.

of their own motion, — “nor *are given* in marriage,” — as women by their relatives ; which form of expression is admirably expressive of what originates from man and not from God, as do all unions of evil and error, and all marriages in which evil and error are inwardly regarded. Accordingly, in the only other passage in which the same phrase occurs, this is obviously its meaning, “As in the days that were before the flood, they were eating and drinking, *marrying and giving in marriage*, until the day that Noe entered the ark, and knew not till the flood came and took them all away.” * Evidently, in the wicked persons who perished by the flood no spiritual marriage but that of evil and falsehood could be formed ; and by them no natural marriages but such as are outward forms of the same could be contracted ; and if it be reasonable to suppose that the same phrase bears the same sense when it occurs elsewhere under similar circumstances, there can be no doubt that this is the sense which *marrying and giving in marriage* bears in the case before us. Thus understood, the answer to the Sadducees and that to the Pharisees are in strict agreement ; otherwise they are in direct opposition. If we suppose the true meaning of the answer to the Sadducees to be, that in heaven there are no marriages whatsoever, the answer to the Pharisees is flatly contradicted. That answer admits of no explanation which will reconcile it with this notion. The statement there made is of the most uncompromising kind. The union of the sexes is declared to be a provision of the Divine Economy from the beginning, to be effected under the Divine Auspices, and, when so effected, to partake of the Divine Perpetuity ; whilst all separation is declared to originate from man himself ; he is forbidden to cause it ; and its permission, in any case, is ascribed to the hardness of his heart. “He which made them at the beginning made them a male and a female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife : *and they twain shall be one flesh*. WHEREFORE, THEY ARE NO MORE TWAIN BUT ONE FLESH. WHAT THEREFORE GOD HATH JOINED TOGETHER, LET NOT MAN PUT ASUNDER. — Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives : but from the beginning it was not so.” When it is here said : “*Wherefore they are no more twain but one flesh*,” have we not the most explicit assurance, that a pair so united can never be sundered *any more* ? What else can be the purport of the emphatic words “*no more*” ? And when it is added, “*What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder*,” are we not assured, as Mrs. Fletcher truly explains it, that, “*what is of God shall stand*” ? To suppose that

death can divide what God has united, is, also, not only to make death stronger than Omnipotence, but it is to contradict the text, "O death, where is thy sting?" for as Mrs. Fletcher again observes, in a passage not before quoted, "If death can eternally separate kindred spirits, he hath eternally a sting."* It is impossible, then, to suppose, that the divine declaration as to the indissoluble nature of unions made by God, is confined to unions in this life: for this would not only be to exalt the power of death above that of God, but to make empty words of the statement, "They are *no more* twain." And doubtless, if the order of creation, and the design of the Creator, are that the human race should be united indissolubly in pairs, the circumstance of such a union not having commenced in this life cannot prevent its accomplishment in the other.

Thus the meaning of this answer to the Pharisees is most explicit, and it admits of no interpretation which will reconcile it to the answer to the Sadducees, if that be supposed to affirm, that in the other life there are no marriages whatever; whereas if we understand the answer to the Sadducees to mean, what, we have seen, the same phraseology certainly does mean elsewhere;—that in heaven there are no marriages originating in the union of evil and falsehood,—all appearance of contradiction disappears; and the declaration, that "in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven;" harmonizes most beautifully with the other declaration, that they who are in the marriage which originates in the union of goodness and truth, as are all "the angels in heaven," "are no more twain, but one flesh," and that "what God hath joined together," it is not for man to "put assunder."

It is probable indeed that the Sadducees, like many who have come after them, understood the Lord to affirm, that in heaven there are no marriages whatsoever: but it was quite customary with the Lord to give such answers to those who conversed with him, as were understood by them in a contrary sense to the true one, without his correcting their misapprehensions: according to his own statement, that he spoke "to those who were without, in parables" or dark sayings, "that hearing they might hear and not understand." Thus we read,† "The Jews said unto him, What sign showest thou unto us, seeing thou doest these things? Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up. Then said the Jews, Forty and six years was this temple in building; and wilt thou rear it up in three days? But," adds the evangelist "he spake of the temple of his body." He did

* P, 205.

† John ii. 18 — 21.

not however tell them so, but left them to their own notions. Just so in his answer to the Sadducees. He answered their question in a sense strictly true. He told them that there were no marriages, such as alone they thought of in heaven,—such as are of the natural man alone, and not of the spiritual man, and which thus have their true origin in the union of evil and error: and he left them to understand his words in a sense not true, and to suppose that in heaven there are no marriages whatever. The reason of this conduct in this instance, is obvious. It is impossible to impart to such characters as the Sadducees, pure and elevated ideas on the subject of marriage. Explain it as you will; they will still attach to it their gross and merely carnal conceptions. It is better, then, for such persons to think, that in heaven there are no marriages at all, than to think there are any such connections there as they call by the name; for this would indeed be to carnalize heaven. Hence Divine Truth, in mercy, speaks to such characters in proverbs: hence the Sadducees were left to believe, as better for them, that in heaven there are no marriages at all: and hence Divine Providence so overrules men's apprehensions of heavenly things, as is best for their own states, that they who are still capable of forming any but carnal conceptions of the divine institution of marriage, will never be persuaded, even by the clear light in which the subject is placed in the writings of Swedenborg, that exists in heaven.

II. We are now to pass to a less pleasing subject.

If it be certain that such marriages as originate in the heavenly marriage of goodness and truth exist in heaven; and this by reason that man after death is still a man, and the distinction of sex exists in the spirit; and that the circumstances in which spirits and angels are placed are all such as correspond to, and are expressive of their internal state; it will follow, also, that such marriages as the Sadducees thought of, which are connections of the sexes originating in the infernal marriage of evil and falsity, and which the Lord declares have no place in heaven, exist in hell. According to Swedenborg, the state of every one's mind in regard to the connection of the sexes, always agrees exactly with the state of his mind in regard to his reception of the graces constituent of the church: hence, all in whom the church really is, think chastely of marriage, and regard adultery with aversion and even horror; whereas all who are opposed to the principles of the church, think unchastely of marriage and regard adultery with pleasure, even though, by external considerations, they may be restrained from practising it. Thus such characters are truly adulterers, even when they remain within the forms of marriage. As

then man's state in regard to the connection of the sexes always keeps pace with his state in regard to the graces of the church, all in heaven are in the love of marriage, and all in hell are in the love of adultery. The former are chaste conjugal partners; the latter are foul adulterers and harlots. But it would be a great error hence to conclude, that in hell is permitted, as the writer above noticed expresses it, and to which he repeatedly turns as a circumstance so inviting, "the indulgence of keeping a harlot," in the manner that the dissolute practise it on earth. The dissolute keep harlots on earth, because they are not bound by the same duties to them as a wife; because they do not consider themselves under, to them, any obligation of fidelity, and can dismiss or change them at pleasure; thus, because, as is so often boasted, they retain their liberty, and are not under the irksome restraint, as such characters esteem the tie of marriage. But in hell such license is not permitted. A wicked man, when he becomes a spirit, is indeed allowed to associate himself with one of the opposite sex; and all the females there are by Swedenborg called harlots, because they all are such in heart, and because it would be a prostitution of the title to apply to such the sacred name of wife; but, as is even stated in a passage cited by an accuser to support his calumnies, "he is forbid, on pain of punishment, to connect himself with more than one." Thus those whom Swedenborg calls harlots, the accuser would call "their lawful wives:"* and then, perhaps, the delightful fascination, which he represents as inseparably connected with the name of *harlot*, would be gone. As to the *delightfulness* of such cohabitation, it may be in some measure appreciated from what is experienced by those who are tied to an utterly abandoned companion here; and when this is the character of both, it is well known that such scenes of horror here arise, as every one acknowledges to exhibit on earth an image of hell. What then must be the case in hell itself, where, as Swedenborg affirms, they not only soon regard each other with the utmost coolness and disgust, "but interiorly burn with deadly hatred against each other, which is so great as to admit of no description!"†

If then the distinction of sex is rooted in the spirit, it is certain that there must be connections between the sexes in hell as well as in heaven: but those in hell, it is evident, must be of a diametrically opposite character to those in heaven. Where there is the infernal marriage of evil and falsehood in the mind, as in the case with all in hell, the connections between the sexes must derive their essence from that origin; and as all evil is inseparably conjoined, in the other life, with pun-

* See Anti-Swedenborg, p. 68. † Treat. on Heaven and Hell, n. 337.

ishment and misery, such infernal marriages, *alias* adulteries, can be productive of no sensations which have not misery in their centre. Whether these can yet be so delightful as to outweigh all the other miseries, with which, as we shall see in the sequel, the inhabitants of hell are pursued, and to make hell a place to which "our paupers may go on speculation," let the reader judge.

The foregoing statements include the essential doctrine of Swedenborg respecting marriage and adultery, and the continuance of the former, in an exalted state, in heaven, and of the latter, in a restricted state — so restricted as not to differ from what some would call "lawful marriage" — in hell. All that has been so extensively circulated against those doctrines, as sanctioning impurity, is gross, unfounded slander. Assuredly, the "whoremongers," that "have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone,"* will not cease to be such when cast there. It is divinely declared, that "he that is filthy shall be filthy still."† It is also declared, that "he that is holy shall be holy still."† Consequently the holy love of marriage shall exist in heaven. If the plain testimony of Scripture, the most obvious deduction of Reason, and the most decided convictions of the intelligent and pious, be sufficient to determine this question, no question, it appears, from what has been adduced above, can be more conclusively decided. The Lord himself is a Husband, and heaven is a marriage. Of such marriages as originate in the marriage of goodness and truth, the Truth itself — God Incarnate — declares, that they shall never be put asunder; and all who by living near to heaven, like Mrs. Fletcher, or by the occasional illapses of a heaven-descended intelligence, like some of the great poets, have been qualified to judge of the subject correctly, have here set, to their seal, that God is true.

* Rev. xxi. 8,

† Ch. xxii. 11.

SECTION VI.

HEAVEN AND HELL; AND THE APPEARANCES IN THEM, AND
IN THE INTERMEDIATE REGION, OR WORLD OF SPIRITS.

PART V.

*Other Circumstances in Heaven, Hell, and the World of Spirits,
differing from what is usually conceived.*

Out of the important truths established in PARTS II. and III. of this SECTION, — *That all the inhabitants of the spiritual world were originally men in the natural world, — That man, after death, is no less a real and substantial man than before, — and, That all the circumstances in which he then finds himself are outward expressions of his inward state; —* there cannot but arise a great variety of circumstances, in the other life, differing from what is usually conceived. While all real angels and devils are regarded as beings of a totally different origin and nature from man; and while man himself, when divested of his natural body, is viewed as a mere shade or phantom; no distinct conceptions respecting the circumstances in which such imaginary beings exist can possibly be formed; and from the merely negative imaginations thereupon assumed, circumstances which are perfectly natural and rational when all the inhabitants of the spiritual world are known to be real men, — men by origin, men by nature, and substantial men still, though no longer invested with an earthly body, — will be deemed repulsive and incredible. Such is the great truth, of the existence of a marriage-union in heaven, and of an opposite connection in hell; which, nevertheless, I trust, has been shown to the rest on solid grounds, both Scriptural and rational. It being my desire, in this Appeal, to meet all the principal or most plausible of the difficulties raised by our adversaries, I will now notice the chief of the other general circumstances, attending the state of the inhabitants of the other life, which have been made subjects of obloquy and derision; and I trust it will still appear, when it is known and borne in mind that the inhabitants of the other life are such different beings from what has been groundlessly assumed, that nothing is stated respecting them

by the illustrious Swedenborg, but what is reasonable and probable, being agreeable to the nature of beings who are all of the human race, who are real and substantial human beings still, and who are placed in outward circumstances corresponding to their internal state.

I. The first circumstance that we will here notice, because it has been represented as supremely ridiculous, is *That spiritual beings partake of food* : — if not to keep them in existence, (since, certainly, they never can die), to keep them in the consciousness and satisfactory enjoyment of their life.

With respect to the Scripture-testimony on this subject, we have noticed above that it would evidently appear, from the circumstance of Ezekiel and John's eating a roll or book when they were in the spirit, having no senses or faculties in action but those belonging to the spiritual body, and from their tasting what they ate, that eating and tasting are faculties belonging to the spiritual part of man as well as to his natural part; and that if they could be performed by prophets, while *in the spirit*, they must equally be proper to the spirit itself, when living as a real man after death. Accordingly, we find the Scriptures mentioning explicitly *the food of angels*, and *the bread of heaven*. The Psalmist, when speaking of the Israelites being fed with manna in the wilderness, says, that they "had given them of the corn of heaven," and "man did eat angels' food ;"* and in another Psalm, "He satisfied them with the bread of heaven."† Now though the *corn* and *bread of heaven* might be equivocal expressions, and might only mean, corn or bread rained down from heaven ; yet in the expression *angels' food*, if that is the proper translation,‡ there is no ambiguity ; it literally implies that angels have food of some kind ; and this determines the other expressions — the *corn* and *bread of heaven*, — to mean the same thing, — the food of the inhabitants. Those then who would abide by the letter of the Word in far more incomprehensible statements than this, cannot consistently deny, that, if the letter of Scripture is to decide this question, there is literally *bread in heaven*, which is the *food of angels*. The same would appear from the Lord's declaration, that "many shall come from the east and the west, and from the north and the south, and sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and

* Ps. lxxviii. 24, 25.

† cv. 40.

‡ Of which there seems no reasonable doubt. The word rendered *angels* literally signifies the *strong* or *mighty ones*, and is applied to angels in Ps. ciii. 20. As the manna is meant, which was rained down from heaven, — by the mighty ones, whose food it is called, must certainly be meant the inhabitants of heaven. Accordingly, it is rendered *angels* in the principal of the ancient versions.

Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven ;”* for the word here translated *sit down*, properly means, *to recline at table*, as was practised by the ancients at their meals. We also read of *eating of the fruit of the tree of life*.†

Such being the language of Scripture, Milton takes it literally, and applies it to the angels. Of this author much the same remark may be made as was offered above‡ respecting Young. When writing from the erroneous doctrine which he had imbibed, he often falls into great absurdities (of which his work on Christian Doctrine, lately discovered, affords more extraordinary examples than even his *Paradise Lost*) ; but when writing from common perception, and admitting the exercise of enlightened reason he frequently offers the most beautiful sentiments and most important truths. Under the influence of such perception and reason, he makes the angel Raphael say to Adam :

“ Food, alike, those pure
Intelligential substances require
As doth your rational ; and both contain
Within them every lower faculty
Of sense, whereby *they hear, see, smell, touch, taste.*”§

So in his description of a great day of assembly in heaven, he introduces a feast :

“ All in circles as they stood,
Tables are set, and on a sudden piled
With angels’ food, and rubied nectar flows
In pearl, in diamond, and massy gold. —
They eat, they drink, and, in communion sweet,
Quaff immortality and joy ; secure
Of surfeit, where full measure only bounds
Excess ; before the all bounteous King, who showered
With copious hand, rejoicing in their joy.”||

The same author represents the appetite for food among the infernals to be at times made an occasion of punishment, leading them eagerly to devour fruit of fair appearance but loathsome substance :

“ They, fondly thinking to allay
Their appetite with gust instead of fruit
Chewed bitter ashes, which the offended taste
With spattering noise rejected : oft they assayed,
Hunger and thirst constraining,” &c.¶

And Watts, in sober prose, suggests a similar thought, “ What” says he, “ if the creatures which they have abused should be made instruments and mediums of their punishment ? Wine may be rendered a frequent means of sickness, agony, and

* Matt. viii. 11.

† Rev. ii. 7 ; xxii. 2.

‡ Pp. 300, 301.

§ P. L. v. 407, &c.

|| Ib. 631, &c.

¶ B. x. 564, &c.

pain, to the drunkard, and meat and other dainties to the glutton."* Addison, also, in a beautiful paper in the Spectator,† supposes that in heaven *all* the senses will be gratified, not excluding, though not expressly mentioning, that of taste. "I have only," he observes, "considered this glorious place with regard to sight and imagination; though it is highly probable that *our other senses* may here likewise enjoy their highest gratifications," &c. In some form then, and as applied to some purpose or other, our greatest writers have entertained the belief, that food is not unknown in the spiritual world: when proposed by them, it is read as a sublime thought or reasonable suggestion: why then, when read in Swedenborg, is it turned into ridicule?

But whatever of the ridiculous might be thought to attach to such a circumstance, will altogether vanish, when it is known, that the food which they thus eat is but an outward appearance, expressive of that food which supports the life of their minds. What is truly spiritual food, but that which nourishes the mind? Hence, how common is it to draw a metaphor from the subject in common discourse; to talk of our *intellectual appetite*, to speak of *knowledge* as *mental food*, and to call *the communication of kind feelings and elevated sentiments in conversation*

" *The feast of reason*"

" *The flow of soul.*"

The true nourishment of angels, then, is nothing but that goodness and truth which is continually imparted to them from the Lord; and of nothing else do they think when engaged in taking the spiritual substance which is furnished them for outward food. This is purely a development, in outward form, of the spiritual gifts with which their minds are continually recreated. But as the mind is not anything except there be some substantial form in which it may exist, so that the form of an angel, though the express image of his mind, is something distinct from the mind itself; therefore, as the mind requires to be continually nourished and fed by the communication to it from the Lord of affections and perceptions of goodness and truth, or love and wisdom, so does analogy require that the personal form, in which the mind dwells, should be nourished, and kept in order for acting as the proper instrument of the mind, by corresponding means. But the latter is never separated from the former in the idea of an angel: and throughout the spiritual world, it is only as the spiritual nourishment of the mind is received from the Lord, that the other food is afforded; because this is merely the outward image of

* Works, Ed. Leeds, vol. vii. p. 261.

† No. 580.

the former, — an appearance corresponding to it. Hence it is stated by our author, in one of the extracts quoted by the adversary whose steps I chiefly follow, respecting those who are in hell, who cannot receive anything of goodness or truth in their minds, that they are compulsively made to do something that is of some use ; and, as they do this, they receive the other food also : but as they cannot *will* to do anything useful, their outer food is of a wretched and disgusting nature ; — as we read of the prodigal, who was fain to feed upon husks.

2. Almost as objectionable as the idea of spirits *eating*, is, in this opponent's estimation, that of their *sleeping* ; and he is particularly indignant that such a refreshment should be allowed to infernals. He quotes three or four texts to support his notion, that nothing like sleep can ever enter hell : but the only one of them which even *appears* at all applicable to the subject is this : “ And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever : and they have *no rest* day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name.” * But if *rest* here means sleep, and this text proves that there is *no sleep* in hell, there are many which will prove that there is *eternal sleep* in heaven ; for heaven is constantly represented as a state of *eternal rest*. Evidently then, *rest* in the Scriptures is not mentioned in contrast with *waking*, but with the intranquility which ever attends the presence of evil lusts and their accompanying false persuasions ; from which they who are in heaven are forever delivered, and by which they who are in hell are for ever actuated and agitated ; whence it may be inferred that even their sleep cannot bring peace, their life being still the mere life of lusts, but must be disturbed and unrefreshing ; but it will not follow that they have no sleep, or not anything analogous to sleep, at all. Even this text, if it proves any thing on the subject, proves the reverse of that for which it has thus been cited : for it speaks of *day and night*, that is, of changes of state analogous to day and night, as existing in hell ; and the same book uses the same phrase † to describe the changes of state existing in heaven ; and surely it is to be inferred that, in one of those states, something is experienced approaching to the nature of sleep. We are told, indeed, that “ He that keepeth Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep.” Of the Infinite, this is doubtless a proper attribute ; and as exclusively so, most probably, as Infinity itself : for it is much to be questioned whether any inferior nature can keep all its faculties forever on the stretch, and never need a refreshment analogous to that which we denominate sleep. They who have exercised their reason upon the subject

* Rev. xiv. 11.

† Ch. iv. 8.

have concluded otherwise. To cite again from him, who

“Into the heaven of heavens *fain would* presume,
An earthly guest, and draw empyreal air,”

and who, if he sometimes offers, as the result of his flights, the mere illusions of his muse, does also sometimes delineate scenes such as really exist in heaven. Such is the case when he speaks of

“When ambrosial Night
—— the face of brightest heaven had changed
To grateful twilight, (for night comes not there
In darker veil,) and roseate dews disposed
All but the unsleeping eyes of God to rest.” *

3. The next thing which we will notice, and which equally admits of a satisfactory explanation when it is known that all that appears about spirits and angels, with all that is done by them, is a mere outward expression of their internal state, is, *That those who are in a bad state, and in preparation for hell, are represented as falling into silly and ridiculous actions, and uttering extravagant sentiments.* But if it be true, as observed above,† that with the wicked in the other life no true rationality remains, what better could be expected? What more rational than to conclude, that the dementation arising from their utter alienation from the Source of Wisdom, would discover itself in practices expressive of, and corresponding to, their infatuated state?

Thus the guide I am following cites an account of the folly of some, (but which only possesses them for a short time during a certain state,) under the influence of which they employ themselves in building with all sorts of materials incoherently put together, so that what is built up in the day falls down in the night. This is one of the mere illusions resulting from the phantasy which possesses those of whom it is affirmed, who are such teachers as have endeavored, in this life, to construct false systems of doctrine by misapplications of the truths of the Word. It is somewhat extraordinary that this should have been selected as objectionable by an opponent, who commends‡ the hell of the ancient mythology, all the descriptions of which are obviously figurative; and when he particularly mentions with approbation the story of Sisyphus, whose punishment consisted in rolling a great stone to the top of a hill, which always, before he could get it there, broke away and rolled down again! for who does not see that this is merely a different symbolic representation of much the same spiritual thing and state, — of the attempt to give stability to the confirmations of falsehood?

* P. L. vi. 642, &c.

† P. 325.

‡ Anti-Swedenborg, p. 68.

As to the extravagant sentiment ascribed by Swedenborg to evil spirits, what more appropriately in character can be conceived? Thus his derider extracts an account of the conversation of a Satanic spirit, in which he denies the existence of a God, and ascribes all things to nature, exactly in the style of certain *philosophers*, (to which class, when in the world, he had belonged), except that he exposes the extravagant absurdity of such opinions more unguardedly than is commonly done on earth. Sometimes, also, Swedenborg represents those who had been confirmed in the common doctrines of a trinity of persons in the Godhead and justification by faith alone to the complete exclusion of charity, as broaching their views of those subjects in such naked deformity as to appear utterly ridiculous. But what is there in this which is not really in conformity with, and inherent in, the very nature of things? Such false sentiments of philosophy and religion, viewed in themselves, are absurdity itself. When propounded by those who entertain them in the world, they are usually put forth with much caution, and great art is used to gloss over their ridiculous points, and to give them a specious appearance.* But in the other world, disguise is not possible. That is the world of essences, and things there appear such as, in their essence, they are. They who are sufficiently dementated by false persuasions grounded in an evil life to be confirmed in doctrines that are intrinsically absurd, there avow them in all their extravagance without being conscious of their absurdity.

Is it not generally believed that all injurious false persuasions originate from hell? Is it not then reasonable to conclude, that in hell they exist in their essences, and thus that there, and in those who are preparing for hell in the world of spirits, they show themselves in their palpable folly, as well as in their falsehood? What greater inconsistency can there be than to suppose, that let a man's sentiments here be ever so wicked and erroneous, they are at once corrected on his entering eternity, and that he no sooner becomes actually a devil, than he grows as wise as an angel? It is true that every wicked person is convinced of the truth, and of his own true state, before he is cast into hell; but he cannot retain it; and, with all the augmentation of cunning that is consequent on his becoming a spirit, he never can possess a grain of genuine rationality. What can be conceived more deplorable? And is not this view of the subject that of rationality itself? Most consonant then to genuine rationality are all Swedenborg's delineations of the character and conversation of infernal spirits. Scripture also represents them as putting darkness for light, and

light for darkness ;” * and as being possessed with so strong a delusion as to believe a lie. †

4. We will now notice the assertion of our Author, *That the inhabitants of heaven, hell, and the intermediate state, all have some employment.* This is a statement which has been a source of misrepresentation and abuse without end : though it arises naturally out of the two general principles we have laid down, and must be true, if man after death is really a man, and is something more than a mere vapor, a puff of breath, a mere nothing.

But first let it be observed, that to suppose that we believe, and that the writings of Swedenborg affirm, that every one is to follow in the other life *the same employment as was his business here*, is a gross misconception ; it is one, also, which falls to the ground of itself, when it is known, that it is constantly affirmed in those writings, that every thing which relates to food, habitation, and clothing is, in the eternal world, provided and given gratis immediately from the Lord ; for when you take away the employments connected with providing food, habitation, and clothing, you take away nearly all that are known upon earth. To suppose then, because in an extract cited against us, the author’s Latin expression (*munia suorum officiorum*) had been not very properly rendered by the common English phrase, *the labor of their callings*, that this means, that every one follows in the other life the same calling that he pursued here, is a very great mistake indeed. The most general of the employments of angels arise out of their office as “ministering spirits, sent forth to minister unto them that are heirs of salvation,” — a doctrine which the Scriptures affirm, and which all Christians believe. There are also employments connected with the administration of affairs in every one of the innumerable societies into which heaven is divided ; for though the Lord guides and governs all things, yet he there also, as well as in his guardianship over the human race, makes use of the ministration of the angels themselves, and thus fills them with that sense of real happiness which is inherent in the performance of useful services, when done from the love of the Lord and of our neighbor. As to manual operations in heaven, all that our Author says respecting them is, that they are such as cannot be described by any words of natural language. In the intermediate region or world of spirits, however, which is the first receptacle of departed spirits, and where, *at first*, their state is not very different from what it was in this life, there are employments more similar, it would appear, to some upon earth ; and *it is by confounding our author’s descriptions of this*

* Isa. v. 20.

† 2 Thess. ii. 11.

state with his descriptions of heaven, that his adversaries have framed the most specious of their misrepresentations. According to Swedenborg's mode of describing this subject, every one, on entering the other life, is at first in his *externals*, and then in a state not unlike that in which he was in this world: but this is successively put off, as his *internals* are opened; when the whole scene changes with him, and he passes to his final home in heaven or in hell. Of the nature of the employments in hell he offers no description beyond this: that they are mean drudgeries.*

Now that this view is reasonable as well as Scriptural is evident from the fact, that pious men have often formed very similar ideas. Thus the celebrated Dr. Watts has many passages in his *Essay on the Happiness of Separate Spirits*, which might be supposed to have been taken from the writings of Swedenborg, had they not been written before these writings appeared. For instance: — “The souls of men having dwelt many years in particular bodies, have been influenced and habituated to different turns of thought, both according to the various constitutions of those bodies, and the more various studies and businesses and occurrences of life. Surely we may with reason suppose the spirits departing from the flesh, to carry with them some bent and inclination towards various pleasures and *employments*. So we may reasonably imagine each sinful spirit that leaves the body to be more abundantly influenced with the particular vices which it indulged here; whether ambition, or pride, or covetousness, or malice, or envy, or aversion to God and all goodness; and their *various sorts of punishments* may arise from their own variety of lusts giving each of them a peculiar inward torment. — And why may not the spirits of the just made perfect have the same variety of taste and pleasure in that happy world above, according as they were fitted for *various kinds of sacred entertainments* in their state of preparation and during their residence in flesh and blood?” Accordingly, they who have studied the wisdom of God in his works, will in heaven, he thinks, follow up that employment. “Is there not,” he says, “a Boyle and a Ray in heaven; pious souls who were trained up in a sanctified philosophy? and surely they are fitted, beyond their fellow saints, to contemplate the wisdom of God in the works of his hands. — May we not suppose these spirits have some special circumstances of sacred

* See Swedenborg's doctrine on this subject fully stated and elucidated *Int. Rep.* for January, 1834, pp. 22—27; and see a passage which had been mistakenly supposed to favor the notion, that people follow the same employments in heaven as they were engaged in here, fully explained, and shown, upon no possible interpretation, to sanction any such notion, *Int. Rep.* for January, 1833, pp. 323—330.

pleasure, suited to their labors and studies in their state of trial on earth? — But some," he adds, "will reprove me here, and say, What, must none but ministers, and authors, and learned men, have their distinguished rewards and glories in the world of spirits? May not artificers, and traders, and pious women, be fitted by their character and conduct on earth for *peculiar stations and employments in heaven*? " — Which question he answers in the affirmative. "I confess," he further says, "heaven is described as a place of rest; that is, rest from sin and sorrow, &c. — but it never can be such a rest as lays all our active powers asleep, or renders them useless, in such a vital and active world." After concluding that there will be praises there and prayers, he adds (as if he were addressing the opponent who quotes in ridicule a passage in which Swedenborg speaks of preaching in heaven), "Perhaps you will suppose there is no such service as hearing sermons, that there is no attendance upon the word of God there. But are we sure that there are no such entertainments? Are there no lectures of divine wisdom and grace given to the younger spirits there by spirits of a more exalted station?" — "But let the worship of glorious spirits be never so various, yet," says he, "I cannot persuade myself that mere direct acts or exercises of what we properly call worship are their *only* and everlasting work. The Scripture tells us, there are *certain seasons* when the angels come to present themselves before God (Job. i. 6, ii. 1): it is evident then that the *intervals of those seasons* are spent in *other employments*. And when they present themselves before God, it does not appear that mere adoration and praise is their *only business* at the throne." — "Nor is it improper or unpleasant to suppose, that among the rest of their celestial conferences, they shall show one another the fair and easy solution of those difficulties and deep problems in divinity which had exercised and perplexed them here on earth. — Darkness and entanglement shall vanish at once from many of those knotty points of controversy, when they *behold them in the light of heaven* [a peculiar phrase of Swedenborg's]. And the rest shall be matter of delightful instruction for superior spirits to bestow upon those of lower rank, or on souls lately arrived at the regions of light." "The saints above are engaged in many of the same sacred employments with the saints below, but all in a superior degree, and in a more transcendant manner." *

I might extend these extracts from Watts to a great length; for the co-incidence between his surmises and Swedenborg's statements on these subjects is really wonderful. *Nearly every point which has been objected to by the opponents of Swedenborg,*

* Works, Vol. ii. pp. 388, 389, 390, 398, 400, 401, 402, 440.

in what he has advanced respecting the engagements of the inhabitants of the spiritual world, is proposed by Watts as the most probable conclusion of reason. Is it then, I again ask, at all rational to treat Swedenborg as writing irrationally when he advances a thing as a fact, while we admire Watts as writing sensibly when he proposes the same thing as the most reasonable conjecture?

5. The circumstances that we will next vindicate from aspersion, may be stated in the following proposition: That those who die as infants or children all go to heaven: but that at first they appear as children still, and are educated by the ministry of angels till they become adult angels themselves; and that in the mean time they are instructed by such representations of heavenly things as are suited to their tender capacities, and are allowed such recreations as are congenial to their state. Proposed in these terms, what is there here to which the rational faculty does not immediately assent? Yet this is precisely what Swedenborg has advanced, however his adversaries may hold up his statements to ridicule.

When a man dies at an adult age and in a state of regeneration, we may suppose that he is qualified presently to appear in heaven as an angel: but who can imagine that the case is the same with the dying infant? The infant is indeed in a state of innocence; it has never committed or appropriated any thing evil, and thus is secure from hell; but its innocence is the innocence of ignorance, not as yet that of wisdom: it as yet is incapable of appropriating good; consequently, it is not as yet prepared to take its place as an angel. An angel is a form of love and wisdom derived from the Lord; an infant has capacities for becoming such a form: but it is not made such a one by mere death. As an infant is born with only the rudiments of a perfect human body, so also is it born, we know full well, with only the rudiments of a perfect human mind, or, which amounts to the same thing, of perfect human spirit, since it is the spirit which is the seat of the mind: and the one is to be successively developed and perfected, as well as the other. To suppose, therefore, that, if it passes in this state into the eternal world, the mind and spirit will instantly expand into the fulness of the standard of an angel, is just as reasonable as to imagine, that a new-born child may expand in an instant into the stature of a man. There surely then cannot be a shadow of doubt, that when an infant enters the spiritual world by death, it will appear there in a form exactly answering to the infantile state of its mind; consequently, it must appear there, and be, an infant still. As the faculties of its mind are developed, and it advances in wisdom, it will advance also to the form and appearance of the adult angel. It is reasonable to imagine, as Swedenborg

assures us, that in that world of higher perfection its advancement will be far more rapid than is possible here : yet even there the rudiments of wisdom must first be inseeded, and afterwards be cultivated and enlarged, before the mature angelic state can be attained.

Now under what auspices is this to be effected? Doubtless, under those of the Lord, who is the only Parent known in heaven, and whose especial care and providence, according to the dictates of reason and the statements of Swedenborg, watch over the welfare of helpless and innocent children. But is it to be supposed that he will lead them to maturity there, any more than he does here, without deigning to associate any of these fellow-creatures in the important task? Scripture informs us that, even while here, infants are under the guardianship of angels exercised under the particular providence of the Lord: "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven."* — Is it then to be supposed, that by passing from this world into the other, they not only lose their human parents but their angelic guardians too; that to them the eternal world is an immense desert, where no protectors are near, — where, though helpless infants still, they are friendless and alone? Will no kind angel minister to them in the tender manner which their state requires? Is it the part either of the rational mind or of the feeling heart to ridicule such ministrations, by applying to them, as has been done, the contemptuous title of "*nursing in heaven*? Is there any among the natural affections so exalted as that of the love of children? Is any thing more affecting to be seen on earth, than the care of a fond mother for her offspring, and the delight with which she ministers to their helplessness? Is not the implantation of parental love in the human breast one of the most striking products of the divine love in the Great Parent of all, and one that most nearly imitates its original? Is it not then to be concluded, that this affection, which is heavenly even on earth, will not be extinguished, but exalted, on transplantation into heaven itself, and that they who have here been eminently influenced by a love to children, will be animated by a corresponding but spiritual affection for them there, and will be impelled by it to undertake, with the utmost delight, the charge of the infant-spirits that are continually passing thither? If our ridiculers will put this inquiry to the ladies of their acquaintance, the hearts of all of them, I am sure, will dictate an affirmative answer. Common perception appears to inform every reflecting mind, that such must be the fact, — that the task of receiving the children who enter the

* Matt. xviii. 10.

other world, and nurturing their innocent but uninformed minds in the accomplishments of heavenly wisdom, must be one of the most delightful, and one of the most general, of the employments of angels. Let then every one be careful how he extinguishes in himself or others the principle that would take delight in such offices, and how he too proudly disdains, what no sneers can degrade, the sweetest exercises of charity. Infants, when first landed on the eternal shore, must need such exercises from some quarter; and those by whose instrumentality the Lord administers them, doubtless regard it as a high privilege, and feel in it the most delicious enjoyment. Insensibility, we may be assured, is not an inmate of angelic breasts; and heaven is not peopled with a starched and stiffened race, who deem it beneath their high vocation to descend to the softest and most affecting duties of the meekest tenderness and love. "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God."

If then infants and children at first appear as infants and children in the heavenly world, and advance gradually, though rapidly, to the adult angelic state; so far from being ridiculous, it is in the highest degree reasonable, to suppose, "that in the mean time they are instructed by such representations of heavenly things as are suited to their tender capacities, and are allowed such recreations as are congenial to their state." That their infantile amusements with each other should be such as tend to insinuate into their tender minds a knowledge of, and affection for, divine things, as Swedenborg affirms, has surely no tendency to derogate from the credibility of his narrations. And that the "boys and young men," or youths (by whom are not meant adult angels, as some seem to suppose, but those who are still only in a state of preparation for becoming such), should, between the intervals of their studies and mental and spiritual engagements, be allowed to engage in running and similar exercises, has nothing in it improbable, when we remember our two general principles established above, — that man after death is a real substantial man, and that all that appears about him (or is done by him) is some correspondent expression of the state of his mind. Do our adversaries think, that if the youths in heaven are as really human beings as the youths here, they will never engage in any outward recreations? While not yet angels, nor possessed of adult angelic wisdom, do they conceive they ought to affect it (according to the Pharisee's notions of it) by a melancholy elongation of countenance, a sluggish solemnity of gait, and by avoiding, as far as possible, to make any use of their external powers? So have not thought any who have ventured to allow their ra-

tional faculty to form conclusions on the subject. Witness, again, the poet Milton, who introduces active sports among the recreations which he deemed worthy of angels, and (strange indeed for a Puritan!) included even dancing among the number. Is not the following description of a scene in heaven equally beautiful and heavenly?

"That day, as other solemn days, they spend
In song and dance about the sacred hill;
Mystical dance, which yonder starry sphere
Of planets, and of fixed, in all her wheels,
Resembles nearest; mazes intricate,
Eccentric, interwolved, yet regular
Then most, when most irregular they seem:
And in their motions, Harmony divine
So smooth her charming tones, that God's own ear
Listens delighted."*

And he describes the angelic guards who watched in Paradise as amusing themselves thus:

"Betwixt these rocky pillars, Gabriel sat,
Chief of the angelic guards awaiting nigh:
About him exercised heroic games
The unarmed youth of heaven."†

Now if a poet may, without offence, represent angels created such as recreating themselves with dancing and athletic games, is it at all censurable seriously to conclude, that youths transplanted from this world, who as yet are not angels, but still have youthful or boyish minds, may at intervals recreate themselves in a similar manner? And this becomes still more probable when it is considered, that such exercises are exact correspondences, outwardly, of their inward state. Their state is a state of instruction, and of advancement in knowledge and intelligence towards the goal of wisdom; and of such a state, the exercise of running, in particular, is exactly representative; and it is no doubt a result of this correspondence, that youth in the world, during the age of instruction, so spontaneously betake themselves to such exercises. The apostle Paul often draws images from the athletic exercises in use in his age, to illustrate the Christian progress: evidently, then, he saw in them something of a significant character. In the present day, even, something of the correspondence of such sports is intuitively seen: thus we familiarly talk of *arriving at the goal*, of *hitting the mark*, and of "*Keeping the ball up of debate*;" which last metaphor is taken from the games of handball and tennis, and evinces a perception, that those games bear an analogy to intellectual exercises and discussions.

*. P. L. v. 618, &c.

† B. iv. 519, &c.

Since then boys and youths in the other life still have boyish and youthful minds (for as soon as their minds lose this character they cease to appear as boys and youths); and since boyish and youthful minds cannot be kept continually fixed on serious studies, it seems a dictate of reason to conclude, that their intellectual exercises will at times alternate with external exercises corresponding to them; and that in heaven, where nothing whatever is done but for the sake of some use, by such exercises their intellectual acquirements may become fixed and confirmed; as, in the world, by moderate exercise, the formation of the chyle and its passage into the system are assisted, and the mental faculties, also, are refreshed and strengthened. Then let not Pharisees sneer at the notion of boyish sports permitted to boys in heaven, or think that the angelic character would be better formed in them by fixing them immovably on a cloud to sing hymns to eternity; or by allowing them, instead of ungracious running, to flit about on a pair of little wings, forming a sort of dish to hold their chubby cheeks. Let them remember, that if such juvenile recreations form no part of the proper felicities of heaven, they are at least used by the prophet as proper symbols for expressing those felicities: "And the streets of the city shall be full of boys and girls, playing in the streets thereof."*

6. Only one other occasion of scandal seems necessary here to be mentioned: but that is a grievous one indeed, as Pharisees would make it. It is, *That one mode of instruction, in the other life, is by means of scenic representations.* That this should be considered as such a matter of offence, is, however, a striking example of the power of prejudice, and of the disposition of mankind to condemn for a mere name, however unexceptionable or excellent may be the thing to which that name is affixed.

That scenic representations in the world deserve but too much of that disesteem in which they are held by many pious persons, is abundantly true. As usually conducted, a most powerful engine is made the subject of great abuse; and many instantly argue from the abuse against the use; they seem determined to consider the whole machine as purely diabolical, even when employed in a manner purely angelical. On earth, the abuse is, perhaps, nearly inseparable from the use. In a corrupt state of society, the pieces composed will never have pure instruction as the first end in view: their main object will ever be to amuse, and to obtain success by flattering the taste of the spectators. Among the spectators will always be a great number of the most dissolute portion of society; and very ex-

* Zech. viii. 5.

emplary virtue is not to be expected from the performers as a body. Altogether, it is but too true, that our theatres are scenes of contagion: and as their attractions are also fascinating, it is no wonder if, by many of the pious, they are utterly proscribed. But suppose all this to be reversed: suppose the pieces performed to have no tendency but, by the most engaging means, to encourage and animate virtue and piety; suppose all the performers to be persons actuated by the sincerest desire to promote the same sacred object; and suppose all the spectators to be the best of characters likewise, attending the exhibition with a greater desire to be improved than amused, and to make the amusement completely subservient to the improvement: and what would there then be in the whole unworthy of heaven itself? The beautiful remarks of Addison in the *Spectator** on the moral uses to which the stage is capable of being applied, are well known: and even Watts, whom no one will accuse of laxity of moral or spiritual principle, allows, that it is only the abuse that makes the theatre an evil. "A dramatic representation," he observes, "of the affairs of human life, is by no means sinful itself: I am inclined to think, that valuable compositions might be made of this kind, such as might entertain a virtuous audience with delight, and even with some real profit. Such have been written in French."† Indeed, the drama was originally connected with religion: among the ancients, dramatic performances formed part of the solemnities of their religious festivals; and on their revival in more modern times, the subjects of them were taken from the Scriptures, the theatre for performing them was the church, and the performers were the clergy. Suppose them then to be not only restored to their original design, but exalted to all the excellence of which they are capable: and will they, we repeat, be unworthy of a place among the instructive recreations of heaven? — at least, of some of the societies of the lowest heaven? for it is only thus connected that Swedenborg mentions their existence. And, as mentioned by him, what is there justly to offend the most fastidious? His words are, "There are, moreover, dramatic entertainments exhibited upon theatres out of the city; the actors representing the graces and virtues of moral life; amongst whom are inferior characters for the sake of relatives [or relation]. No virtue with its graces and decencies can be represented to the life, but by means of relatives, in which all its graces and decencies, from the greatest to the least, are comprised and represented; and the inferior characters represent the least, even till they become none: but it is provided that nothing of the opposite, or of what is unbecoming and dis-

* Nos. 89 and 93.

† On Education, Works, vol. vii. p. 566.

honorable, should be exhibited, except figuratively and remotely. It is so provided, because nothing that is becoming and good in any virtue, can by successive progressions pass over to what is unbecoming and evil ; it only proceeds to its least, where it perishes ; and then, and not till then, its opposite commences : so that heaven, where all things are becoming and good, has nothing in common with hell, where all things are unbecoming and evil.”* What is there, in this account of the matter, that is in the slightest degree unbecoming, or unworthy of heaven ? Who that can in the least distinguish between names and things, can look at the thing here described, and think that it is at all unlikely to be among the means of instruction for “junior spirits,” in the angelic world ? Were not, in fact, the surprising scenes exhibited to John in the Revelation, completely of the nature of dramatic representations ? And if such a mode of instruction can be resorted to in the case of the prophets, by the Divine Being himself, is it unreasonable to suppose that an inferior species of the same kind of instruction may be beneficial to novice angels ?

I have now gone through the chief of the particulars mentioned in the writings of Swedenborg, and derided by our adversaries, which can with any plausibility be constructed into matters of offence ; and I trust that, when considered with reference to their proper causes, and to the nature of man after death, of the circumstances in which he is placed, and of the appearances around him, all the facts must be allowed to be in perfect harmony with the statements of Scripture and with the dictates of reason ; — that the true ground of offence must be admitted to exist solely in the unfounded prejudices of our opponents, — in the vague, shadowy conceptions, which in the acknowledged absence of all specific knowledge, they had formed for, and from, themselves. But to make this examination in all respects complete ; and being desirous that everything which our enemies censure as objectionable should be viewed in the fullest light ; an Appendix shall be added, in which each of the remaining *Sundered Scraps* that the writer I chiefly follow has adduced to substantiate his calumnious imputations, shall be separately considered. At present I will conclude with observing, that if even they who have dreamed of angels, good and evil, as beings of totally different origin and nature from men, have yet been obliged, as we have seen, in effect to make men of them before they could form respecting them any determinate ideas ; if having made them men, they have been compelled to represent the world they inhabit as very similar, in appearance, to the world inhabited by men ;

* Tr. Chr. Rel. n. 745.

thus if the great poet felt it necessary to suggest, as quoted above,

——— “What if earth
Be but the shadow of heaven, and things therein
Each to other like, more than on earth is thought:” —

if the most elevated geniuses, though they assign to angels a nature different from the human, are constrained to represent them as speaking, acting, and existing in circumstances, only suitable to the nature of human beings, after all: — how far from ridiculous is it in Swedenborg, having rationally and scripturally evinced that all angels and spirits really are men, to place them in circumstances, and ascribe to them actions, suitable to the nature of men, — either of men little changed from what they are here, as is the case with all, on first entering the world of spirits, — or of men exalted to high degrees of angelic wisdom and goodness, as is the state of those in heaven, — or of men degraded to awful depths of infernal wickedness and insanity, as is the state of those in hell?

SECTION VI.

HEAVEN AND HELL; AND THE APPEARANCES IN THEM, AND IN
THE INTERMEDIATE REGION, OR WORLD OF SPIRITS.

PART VI.

Swedenborg's General Views respecting Heaven and Hell obviously agreeable to Reason and Scripture.

IF we have succeeded, as I trust will be the opinion of the Candid and Reflecting, in vindicating the most peculiar and uncommon of the ideas presented in the writings of Swedenborg, respecting the other life and its inhabitants, from the ridicule and contempt which it has been attempted to throw upon them, and in showing that even these, how different soever from what is usually conceived, are in no respect adverse either to Reason or to Scripture; it cannot be difficult to evince, that the General Views presented in those writings respecting Heaven and Hell are obviously agreeable to all that Reason and Scripture depose upon the subject; and that, in fact, nothing is *here* presented that can be deemed inconsistent with the usual conceptions of the Christian world. On these General Views, then, it cannot be needful to dwell at much length, though it would

be an unpardonable omission not to notice them at all. Besides, even in this respect, the views of the New Church, obviously rational and Scriptural as they are, have not been allowed to pass unassailed. As much then of their nature must unavoidably be stated, as is necessary to rebut the chief of the calumnies which have been published against them. But in confining myself to this; — in forbearing to enlarge upon *this* subject, I am well aware that I am foregoing a great advantage; for the views we entertain respecting heaven and hell in general only require, I am sure, to be fully and fairly exhibited, to win the admiration, and charm the affections, of all the candid and reflecting aspirants for the heavenly kingdom.

To generate odium, the opponent whom I have chiefly taken as a guide, imputes to us, by a most unaccountable misrepresentation, as noticed above,* the denial of “a future reckoning day and an hereafter of rewards and punishments;” so now, for the same purpose, he represents us as abolishing the difference between heaven and hell. “The Baron,” he affirms, “by his descriptions of the invisible world, has gone a great way towards making those who will believe him, neither very anxious for heaven, nor much afraid of hell, which, wherever such a feeling obtains, is a dreadful mental disease. For the sanctions of rewards and punishments do mightily restrain from vice, and promote virtue and piety. We are all naturally too remiss in religious duties: there is therefore little need to bereave us of those two great stimulants, *hope* and *fear*.”† So then, Swedenborg deprives virtue and vice of their sanctions: — a serious charge indeed! To be “*afraid of hell*,” however, in its most proper sense, is to be *afraid of evil*; for though *hell* is a place and state of misery, the essence of it is *evil*. The *fear of hell* which is not accompanied with the *fear of evil*, is but a spurious, selfish, and Pharisaic kind of feeling, productive of little benefit either to the individual or to society. A man may be *afraid of hell* in the manner recommended by this opponent, — even of “*the Mahometan’s hell*,” the description of whose terrors he quotes (for he here again refers, for the third or fourth time, to his favorite standard of orthodoxy, “*the Mahometan’s Creed!*”) — without being much *afraid of evil*: and surely it is no light evil continually to sin, as is done by our adversaries, against the commandment, “Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.”

That any man who has ever looked into Swedenborg’s treatise on Heaven and Hell, and by making references to it, wishes it to be believed that he has read it, should be capable of advancing such a calumny as to say, that the Baron’s descrip-

* Pp. 128, 129.

† Anti-Swedenborg, p. 67.

tions of the invisible world tend to make men neither very anxious for heaven nor much afraid of hell; to take away from virtue and vice the prospect of reward and punishment; and to deprive men of those stimulants to good conduct, hope and fear; is truly a deplorable example of the power of theological prejudice; for, most assuredly, never before was heaven represented under so truly attractive, exalted, and glorious an aspect; never was hell depicted so morally appalling, so repulsive for its *credible* horrors.

Is there nothing calculated to render us anxious for heaven, — to make us regard it as a reward of virtue desirable in the highest degree, — in the assurance offered by Swedenborg, that he who enters heaven comes into a scene, where every object that can impart delight salutes his new-quickenened sensations; while yet it is not any thing imparted by outward objects that his happiness essentially consists, though they contribute to its fulness, but in that ineffable sense of blessedness which fills his whole mind, and which is inherent in that life of love, wisdom, and use, by which he is inwardly animated, and into the full activity, and completely developed enjoyments of which, he now finally enters? He is immediately, according to our Author, surrounded by kindred angels, all ready and eager to show him the most winning offices of attention, and in whose society he feels at once entirely at home, as if he were among friends and relatives known to him from infancy; whence his spirits expand, and his life is exalted, being united with the life of all around him; which being all in harmony with his own, and not the slightest disagreement creating an opposing or uncongenial sphere to be felt, occasions such a sense of fulness of delight, as can never here be experienced, nor even conceived. Nor can any description ever exalt the imagination even to the threshold of the state requisite for apprehending it; for it can only be apprehended, as it is, by those in the spiritual state belonging to angels, and which cannot be perceptibly communicated to man in the natural world. Of man in his natural state it will ever be true, as Divine Truth hath spoken, that “Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.” Nor does the experience of our author form any exception to this statement; for it was not to the faculties of his natural part, by which he lived as a man in the world, that the experience was communicated, but to those of his spiritual part, which properly belongs to the spiritual world; and he constantly declares that he can give no description of what it was thus granted him to perceive, that can convey any adequate idea of it to man in the world: all that he sketches

therefore, and all that we can apprehend, is to be regarded but as a faint approximation to the reality. Let those who feel sufficient interest in a subject interesting above all others, consult our Author's work on *Heaven and Hell*; and if they do not, on a serious examination, find his representations of the heavenly state to be heavenly indeed; to be, to the truly rational and justly feeling mind, pre-eminently attractive; and to bear so distinctly the stamp of truth as to indicate that they could only have been derived from positive knowledge; we will admit that he has no higher claim to superior illumination. Let any one turn in particular to the chapters on *the Wisdom of the Angels of Heaven*, on *the State of Innocence of the Angels of Heaven*, on *the State of Peace in Heaven*, and on *Heavenly Joy and Happiness*; and it may surely be affirmed, that if any thing can affect him, and awaken in his bosom any heavenward aspirations, he will find it there. I select a few passages, that the reader may see how easy it would be to make a collection of Extracts from Swedenborg's works, that would powerfully recommend them to the pious and sincere.

"The angels can express by a single word what a man cannot express by a thousand words. Besides, in one angelic expression are conveyed things innumerable, which cannot be expressed by the words of human language; for in every individual thing uttered by angels are included arcana of wisdom in continual succession, to which human sciences cannot reach. The angels also supply, by the tone of their voice, what they do not express fully by the words of their speech; and in the tone of their voice is contained the affection belonging to the things of which they speak in their order: for by the tones they express affections, and by the words the ideas of thought flowing from their affections. Hence it is that the things heard in heaven, are said [by the Apostle Paul] to be ineffable."*

"It is said in heaven, that innocence dwells in wisdom, and that the angels have wisdom in proportion as they have innocence. That this is the case, they confirm by these considerations: That they who are in a state of innocence attribute nothing of good to themselves, but consider themselves only as receivers, and ascribe all to the Lord: that they are desirous to be led by him, and not by themselves: that they love every thing which is good, and are delighted with every thing which is true, because they know and perceive that to love what is good, thus to will and do it, is to love the Lord, and that to love what is true is to love their neighbor: that they live contented with what they have, whether it be little or much, because they know that they receive as much as is profitable for them, little if little be profitable, and much if much: and that they themselves do not know what is profitable for them, because this is known only to the Lord, who hath a view to what is eternal in all the operations of his providence." — "All who are in the good of innocence are affected by innocence, and so far as any one is in that good, so far he is affected. But they who are not in the good of innocence, are not affected by it: wherefore all who are in hell are altogether contrary to innocence, nor do they know what innocence is; yea, they are of such a character, that in proportion as any one is innocent, they burn

*. H. and H. n. 269.

with a desire to do him mischief.”* “The inmost principles of heaven are two, viz. innocence and peace. They are termed inmost principles, because they proceed immediately from the Lord. Innocence is that principle from which is derived every good of heaven, and peace is that principle from which is derived all the delight of heaven. Every good is attended with delight; and both good and delight have relation to love; for whatever is loved is called good, and is perceived as delightful: hence it follows, that those two inmost principles, innocence and peace, proceed from the divine love of the Lord, and affect the angels from an inmost ground.” — “The divine sphere of peace in heaven flows from the Lord, and exists in consequence of his conjunction with the angels of heaven, and in particular in consequence of the conjunction of good and truth in every angel. These are the origins of peace: whence it may be evident, that peace in heaven is the Divine Sphere inmost affecting with blessedness every principle of good there, thus acting as the source of all the joy of heaven; and that in its essence it is the divine joy of the Lord’s divine love, resulting from his conjunction with heaven and with every one there. This joy, perceived by the Lord in the angels, and by the angels from the Lord, is peace. Hence, by derivation, the angels have every blessedness, delight, and happiness, or that which is called heavenly joy.”†

“Every one may know, that when man leaves the external or natural man he comes into the internal or spiritual; whence it may be known that heavenly delight is internal and spiritual, but not external and natural; and since it is internal and spiritual, that it is purer and more exquisite, and that it affects the interiors of man, which are the faculties of his soul or spirit.” — “The delights of heaven are ineffable, and likewise innumerable. But of those innumerable delights not one can be known or credited by him who is in the mere delight of the body or of the flesh; since his interiors look away from heaven and towards the world, that is, backwards. For he who is wholly immersed in the delight of the body or of the flesh, — or, what is the same thing, in the love of self and the world, — has no sensation of any delight but what is to be found in honor, in gain, and in the pleasures of the body and the senses, which so extinguish and choke interior delights, which are those of heaven, that their existence is not believed. Wherefore a person of this description would wonder greatly, if he were only told that there are delights existing when the delights of honor and gain are removed; and still more if he were told, that the delights of heaven succeeding in their place are innumerable, and are such, that the delights of the body and the flesh, which are chiefly the desires of honor and gain, cannot be compared with them. Hence the reason is evident, why it is not known what heavenly joy is.” — “All the delights of heaven are conjoined with, and are in, uses, because uses are the good works of love and charity, in which the angels are principled; wherefore every one enjoys delights of such a quality as are his uses, and likewise in such a degree as is his affection for use.” — “Heavenly joy itself, such as it is in its essence, cannot be described, because it has its seat in the inmost grounds of the life of the angels, and thence in every particular of their thoughts and affections, and from these again in every particular of their speech and actions. It is as if the interiors were fully open and expanded to the reception of delight and blessedness, which is diffused into all the fibres, and thus through the whole angel; whence its perception and sensation are such as to admit of no description: for what commences from the inmost parts, flows into all the parts derived

* Nn. 278, 282.

† Nn. 285, 286.

from them, and propagates itself, with continual augmentation, towards the exteriors. Good spirits, who are not as yet in that delight, because not as yet raised up into heaven, when they perceive it emanating from an angel by the sphere of his love, are filled with such delight, that they fall as it were into a swoon, through the sweetness of the sensation." "That I might know what is the nature of the delights of heavenly joys, it hath been granted me by the Lord to perceive them; wherefore, since I have had living experience, I can know, but not at all describe them: yet something shall be said to give some idea of them. — It was perceived that the joy and delight came as from the heart, diffusing themselves with the utmost softness through all the inmost fibres, with such a sense of enjoyment, that the fibre is, as it were, nothing but joy and delight; and in like manner every perception and sensation thence derived, receiving its life from happiness. The joy of bodily pleasures, compared with these joys, is as a gross and pungent clot compared with a pure and most gentle aura. It was observed, that when I was desirous to transfer all my delight to another, a more interior and fuller delight than the former flowed in its place; and it was perceived that this was from the Lord."*

I know not how these extracts may impress the reader, but I venture to think that every one may in some measure judge of his own spiritual state, according as he is *affected* by them or not; and that whosoever is *affected* by them will be of opinion, that they are in the highest degree worthy of the subject, and that heavenly wisdom, innocence, peace, and joy, could only be so well described by a communication from heaven itself. If any should still think, with our accusers, that such views of *heaven* are calculated to make a man *not very anxious* to attain it, — that they deprive *virtue* of its prospect of *reward*, and bereave us of the *stimulant of hope*; an obviously true solution of the enigma, but a most awful one, is given in the extracts themselves.

If they who believe the testimony of Swedenborg, thus have reason to be animated in the highest degree to secure the joy that is set before them, they also are instigated, by the clearest conviction of the eternal wretchedness which awaits the wicked and impenitent, to shun the paths which lead to its abode. They are assured in the most decisive manner, that the state of those who are inwardly wicked, — who are *confirmed*, in principle as well as in practice and inclination, in the evil dispositions of their corrupt hearts, — will be hereafter intensely miserable; since the increased activity of perception peculiar to those in a spiritual state of existence, whilst it incomparably augments the felicity of the good, must proportionately increase the unhappiness of the bad. We are assured, also, that not only are the inward feelings of the wicked hereafter full of pain and misery, but that, although they are not unceasingly roasted in material fire, without which some of our opponents would fain have it believed that hell cannot be hell, yet actual inflictions of pun-

* Nn. 395, 398, 402, 409, 413.

ishment inconceivably severe, and often reiterated, also await them in the dark world; these being the only means by which their malignant natures can be restrained from breaking forth into such outrages as would disturb the peace of the good, and even endanger the subsistence of the universe. According to Swedenborg, all who are in hell can feel no enjoyment but in the doing of evil: yet no sooner do they attempt it than they fall into punishment. Their existence is thus passed in alternations between two states; in one of which they are in the sense of the privation of all delight, in consequence of being withheld from doing such things as alone are delightful to them, — and this in addition to that turbid wretchedness which lusts such as theirs, even when enjoying their gratifications, carry within them; and in the other they are suffering the positive torture of punishments inconceivably dreadful. This is the hell of which an accuser has declared, he should not be much afraid.

But we will illustrate this subject, also, by a few extracts from our author's treatise on *Heaven and Hell*.

“ Evil spirits are severely punished in the world of spirits, that by punishments they may be deterred from doing evil. This appears as if it were from the Lord; when yet nothing of punishment comes from the Lord, but from evil itself. *For evil is so conjoined with its own punishment, that they cannot be separated.* The infernal crew desire and love nothing more than to do evil, especially to inflict punishment and torment; and they likewise do evil, and inflict punishment, on every one who is not protected by the Lord; wherefore, when evil is done by any from an evil heart, since this rejects from itself all protection from the Lord, infernal spirits rush in upon him who does it, and punish him.” — “ What eternal fire is, — which is mentioned in the Word as the portion of those who are in hell, hath as yet been known scarcely to any one, by reason that mankind have thought materially respecting the things mentioned in the Word, not being acquainted with its spiritual sense: wherefore by this fire some have understood material fire, some torment in general, some the pangs of conscience; and some have supposed that it is mentioned merely to impress the wicked with terror.” — “ The spiritual heat appertaining to man is the heat of his life, because in its essence it is love. This heat is what is meant in the Word by fire; love to the Lord and neighborly love being meant by heavenly fire, and self-love and the love of the world by infernal fire.” — “ Since the lust of doing evils, which originates in the love of self and of the world, is what is meant by infernal fire; and since such lust possesses all who are in the hells; therefore, likewise when the hells are opened, there is seen a sort of fiery appearance, with smoke issuing from it, such as is usually seen from buildings on fire. — But when they are closed, this fiery appearance is not seen, but in its place an appearance like a dark mass of condensed smoke. — It is however to be noted, that they who are in the hells are not immersed in fire, but that the fire is an appearance; — for love corresponds to fire and all things which appear in the spiritual world appear according to correspondences.” — “ As by infernal fire is meant every lust to do evil flowing from the love of self, by it is also meant torment, such as has

place in the hells. For the lust derived from that love is the lust of hurting others who do not honor, venerate, and pay court to the subject of it : and when such lust prevails in every one, in a society which is restrained by no external bonds, such as the fear of the law, and of the loss of reputation, of honor, of gain, or of life, every one, under the impulse of his own evil, rushes upon another, and, so far as he prevails, enslaves the rest and reduces them under his dominion, and from a principle of delight exercises cruelty towards those who do not submit. All the hells are such societies ; wherefore every one there bears hatred in his heart against another, and from hatred bursts forth into cruelty, so far as he prevails." — "As rebellious disturbances continually exist there, since every one there desires to be greatest, and burns with hatred against others, hence come new outrages. Thus one scene is changed for another : wherefore they who had been made slaves are taken out to help some new devil to subjugate others ; when they who do not submit, and yield implicit obedience, are again tormented by various methods. And so they go on continually. Such torments are the torments of hell, which are called infernal fire."* Beside these general miseries, in the first volume of the *Arcana Cœlestia* are described a number of specific inflictions which follow the perpetrators of various crimes.

Now can any thing be conceived more truly horrible than such a state as this, — to be incapable of any delight but in doing injury to others, and to have the injury thus done speedily return upon their own heads ? But our adversaries are offended, that delight under any form, should visit the breasts of infernals : yet every observer of human nature well knows, that even the most atrocious crimes are attended with delight to those who are in the love of them, and that nothing is more true than the observation of our Author, that whatever a man loves he regards as good, and feels as delightful. Thus one well acquainted with the human heart represents Satan as exclaiming,

" Evil, be thou my good ! "†

Again, he makes Satan justly express the nature of evil, and its delight, in the following lines :

" The more I see
Pleasures about me, so much more I feel
Torment within me, as from the hateful seige
Of contraries. All good to me becomes
Bane, and in heaven much worse would be my state.
For only in destroying find I ease
To my relentless thoughts."‡

The same character speaks of his aim as being

" — all pleasure to destroy,
Save what is in destroying ; other joy,
To me is lost."§

But if there are any so lost in this world to all proper feeling as to think this delight of desirable attainment, could it be enjoyed without check (though even then, every one may see

* Nn. 550, 553, 566, 568, 573, 574. † P. L. iv. 110. ‡ B. ix. 119, &c.
§ Ib. 477, &c.


that it would be but a modification of misery); when it can never be gratified without an immediate retribution of shocking torment, can the most abandoned of the human race regard the state where this is inevitable without horror? Is it just to say, as has been done repeatedly,* that "hell is so much mended by the benevolent Baron, that our paupers at least may go there with a very fair prospect of comfort?" Will such direful pictures as have just been presented tend to make a man *not much afraid of hell*? Do they deprive *vice* of its prospect of *punishment*, and *bereave us of the stimulant of fear*? Which is preferable, — so to represent the infernal state of misery (as is done by Swedenborg), as to make it truly terrible to every rightly constituted mind, by depicting its terrors in a manner that does not make the reason revolt at their inconsistency; or so to represent them (as is done by my guide and his "*Mahometan's Creed*"), as to make them absolutely incredible, and thus to destroy the fear of hell altogether? Doubtless, much of the infidelity of the present times is owing to this, as its occasion if not its cause; and they who continue to press impossibilities as articles of Christian faith, are doing their best to aggravate that "dreadful mental disease."

It cannot then, I apprehend, be denied, that in the *general views* given by Swedenborg respecting heaven and hell, there is nothing but what is obviously agreeable both to Reason and Scripture.

In conclusion, what judgment is to be rationally formed respecting the whole of Swedenborg's statements, both general and particular, respecting heaven and hell and the intermediate state or world of spirits, their inhabitants and the circumstances which attend them?

If the accounts of travelers in distant countries are read with delight; if even the minute occurrences which happened on the journey to the travelers themselves, and the familiar anecdotes by which they illustrate the manners of the people and the character of the place, are found to possess great interest, though we never expect to visit those countries ourselves; what delight ought to attend the perusal of an authentic account of that eternal country to which we are all hastening, and with what interest should we hang over a favored traveler's detail of the familiar incidents which are there constantly occurring, and in which we must, ere long, be called to take our share! That a special traveler should be empowered to communicate such information, by no means exceeds, we have seen, the bounds of rational credibility, nor even of probability. The possibility of it is abundantly evinced by the narratives of Scrip-

* Anti-Swedenborg, pp. v. and 68.



ture ; and the facility of it is demonstrated by the views of man's constitution, and of the laws of the spiritual world, discovered in the writings of Swedenborg. Indeed, many divines and philosophers have seen that man is by creation a subject of both worlds, the spiritual and natural. If by his spirit he belongs to the spiritual world, and he has a spirit within him while he lives in the body ; it cannot be difficult for Him who is the Author of both to open the senses of his spirit even while he lives in the body ; he must then be at once perceptibly amid the objects of the spiritual world, in the same manner as he will be after death ; and accordingly, we have seen, it was thus that views of the spiritual world have been vouchsafed to prophets and others. Is it at all surprising then, that such an opening of the spiritual sight should take place in an extraordinary manner, with one individual, at the era of the Lord's second coming ? Most people believe, that in the primeval ages of the world man lived in perpetual society with angels, and that it was not till he had far descended in degeneracy that it came to be the character of "angel visits" to be "few and far between :—" and most people believe, also, that in the latter ages of the world such communications will be restored, and angels will again be closely associated with men : is it then at all unreasonable to expect, that, as preparatory to such a state, should it be the purpose of Providence to produce it, — or in lieu of it, should that be without the provisions of the Divine Economy, — some distinct, accurate, precise, and even familiar knowledge, respecting the eternal world, its appearances, its inhabitants, and its laws, should be communicated, through the instrumentality of one commissioned herald, to beings who belong to it, in part even now, and are soon to belong to it altogether ? When man's former state, and his still unaltered nature as a subject of both worlds, are reflected on, the wonder surely is, that the world of which his better part is a native and a denizen should ever have become so shut out from him, and all particular knowledge respecting it so utterly lost, — not that they should again be restored : and when could their restoration be more appropriately in place, than among the blessings attendant on the second coming of the Lord, and consequent upon the performance of the last judgment ? Whilst then there is so much to give probability on this subject to the statements of Swedenborg, and nothing which, fairly estimated, detracts at all from their credibility ; whilst all the particulars advanced, when their causes are understood, are found to be in the strictest agreement both with Scripture and Reason ; they surely may be pressed upon the Candid and Reflecting as in the highest degree worthy of their attention, because conveying information of the highest interest to man as an immortal.

SECTION VII.

THE TRINITY, AS CENTERED IN THE PERSON OF THE LORD
JESUS CHRIST.

 PART I.
The General Doctrine stated, and established by Scripture.

IF I had formerly arranged this work in two principal Divisions, the second of them would begin with this SECTION: for, having gone through all the “curious” subjects objected against, in the sentiments held by us as those of the New Church predicted under the figure of a New Jerusalem,—being chiefly those which are connected with our Views of the Eternal World and State,—I am now to appeal to you, my Reflecting and Candid Readers, in regard to our Doctrines of Faith and Life. This is the part of the whole subject which is, in reality, of far the higher importance: it is the part of the subject, also, on which every well-disposed mind, having the Word of God to refer to, may most readily determine whether our sentiments are well founded: and it is the part of the subject in regard to which, as we think, we are able most conclusively to evince, that our sentiments are those of the Word of God itself. Were I then to adopt that course which I should most prefer, I should dwell most at length on our Doctrines of Faith and Life; and then again appeal to you to judge, whether a writer who, like the illustrious Swedenborg, was enabled to present, in so clear a light, the certain dictates of truth upon every subject in which we are most interested as Christians, and so completely to clear away the clouds which have so long hung over the doctrinal interpretation of Holy Writ: and who has done this, as he assures us, by virtue of a special illumination, bestowed on him as the Herald of the Second Advent; could possibly be deceived in this assertion, or in anything else which he advances. But, as observed above, I here am compelled to direct my course in the direction marked out for me by our opponents, and particularly by the one whom I have chiefly taken as my guide in regard to the subjects necessary to be considered. As he has filled the greatest part of his Anti-Swedenborg with observations and extracts intended to throw ridicule on the Views of the Eternal World and State presented in the writings of Swedenborg, and on the character of Swedenborg himself; and as these are also the subjects chiefly brought forward by others, and in regard to which the most unfounded and injurious prejudices prevail; I have devoted the greater part of this Appeal to the examination of them on their own merits: and I trust it has sufficiently appeared, that, when the whole of the statements of

Swedenborg respecting them is understood, all must be admitted to be securely established on the immovable basis of Scripture, Reason and Fact. The opponent alluded to, however, has not left our more important doctrinal sentiments unassailed; on the contrary, he has put out all his strength in an attempt to overthrow the most important of them all, — that which presents the Lord Jesus Christ as the Being in whose single Person the whole of the Divine Trinity centers, — as being, himself, the Person of the Father, and thus the proper Object of Christian worship. Like many others, he is hostile to this doctrine, evidently, because it overturns the erroneous view of the Atonement and Mediation of the Lord Jesus Christ: the true nature of which, as exhibited in the doctrines of the New Church, he likewise assails with gross misrepresentations. He also throws some unjustifiable slurs on our sentiments in regard to the Christian Life. The same course has been taken by most of our adversaries. These three subjects then, I propose, as briefly as their importance will admit, to discuss in this and the two following Sections; and so to conclude this Appeal.

That the doctrine of the New Jerusalem respecting the Divine Being and the Trinity in the Divine nature, should be fixed upon by any as an object of attack; that, on the contrary, it should not be eagerly accepted by all who assume the Christian name, as relieving them from difficulties which all ingenuous minds are well aware are not a little embarrassing; are facts which, to us who have embraced it, would appear astonishing, were we not conscious of the power which received opinions and early prejudices always exercise over the judgment of weak and fallible man. All acknowledge, at least in words, that God is and can be but one: yet when it is affirmed, as is done by the majority, that this One God exists in Three Persons, each of whom, "*by himself*" (as the Athanasian Creed expresses it), is God and Lord; a perplexity and confusion are introduced into our conceptions, which many find to be distressing in the extreme. To escape from the embarrassment, numbers have rejected the idea of a Trinity in the Divine Nature altogether; and not seeing how to connect this rejection with an acknowledgement of the Divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ, have refused the honors of divine worship to the Saviour of the world. In the midst of these contending opinions it is, that the New Church which they who have embraced it believe to be prefigured by the New Jerusalem of the Revelation, addresses itself to the candid and reflecting. We see in Scripture too decisive evidence of the Divinity of Jesus Christ, to suffer us, with the Unitarian, to call it in question: on the other hand, we find too strong declarations of the indivisible unity of the Divine nature, to allow

with the Trinitarian, to portion it out between three separate Persons. We take all that is true in the system of each, separated from all that is false. The doctrine of the Tri-personality was first invented, because those who framed it saw no other means of preserving some acknowledgment of the Divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ: and we agree with them, that this acknowledgment is indispensable, in order that any true Church may exist. The doctrine of Unitarianism has been introduced, because they who framed it saw no other way to preserve inviolate the perfect unity of the Godhead: and we agree again with them, that where this is in any degree departed from, no true church can exist. Both these mischiefs are completely avoided in the doctrines of the New Church, as drawn from the Scriptures in the writings of Swedenborg. May I not then appeal to the candid and reflecting, of all Denominations, and ask, whether such a system of Doctrine ought not to be looked at by all with respect; whether it might not be reasonably concluded, that it would excite violent hostility in none, but would be accepted by multitudes of sincere Christians with thankfulness and eagerness? That it is entitled to such acceptance, because it not only proposes what is obviously desirable, but establishes what is certainly true, we will endeavor in some degree to evince.

I. We will state, in the first place, what *the True Doctrine, as advanced in the writings of Swedenborg*, is. All parties will admit, that the unity of God is a doctrine most perpetually insisted upon by Scripture, and constantly held forth as the fundamental idea on which all true religion is erected. It must also be acknowledged, that, though the word Trinity does not occur in Scripture, we repeatedly find the idea properly intended by that term; since we everywhere read, in the New Testament, of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as equally concerned in the great work of man's salvation. It is no less unquestionable, that there are a great many passages, likewise, which ascribe Divinity to the Lord Jesus Christ: for even the deniers of his divinity admit this, though, not knowing how to reconcile this doctrine with that of the unity, they endeavor to explain away their force. On the admission, then, that these three doctrines are explicitly affirmed in Scripture — so affirmed that they naturally result from the sense of the words themselves; how are they to be combined into one coherent sentiment? The fundamental doctrine of the Divine Unity implies, that the doctrine of the Divine Trinity must not be so strained as to be set at variance therewith, as is done when the Trinity is understood to be a trinity of separate persons, in the usual acceptation of that term. It must then be a trinity of Essential Principles, of Constituent Elements (so to

speak, for want of better terms), forming together One Person. And if the Divinity of Jesus Christ is also certain, — thus if he is God at all, and yet God is but one, — who can he be but that One Person? In him, as he decidedly declares, the Father dwelleth: “the Father *that dwelleth in me*, he doeth the works:”^{*} — he must then be the Person of the Father. From him, or out of him, from the Father within him, as he also declares, the Holy Ghost proceedeth: “the comforter, whom *I* will send unto you *from* the Father:”[†] to represent, also, his sending of which, “he *breathed* on them, and said unto them Receive ye the Holy Ghost.”[‡] Does it not then appear, that, properly, the Father is the Divine Essence; the Son, the Manifestation of that Essence in a Personal Form; and the Holy Spirit, the Sanctifying Energy and Influence — the Divine Life — thence proceeding to operate the graces of salvation in the human mind?

II. This is a general view of the Doctrine of the New Church upon this subject: we will adduce a little more of *the Scripture Evidence by which its truth is established.*[§]

As to *the Unity of the Divine Being*, on this, the Sacred Scriptures constantly insist in the most positive language, and never hint at his dwelling in any more persons than one. In the Decalogue, given with such awful solemnity from Mount Sinai as a Summary of all religion, the Divine Legislator declares, as a necessary preliminary to the whole, “Thou shalt have no other gods before ME.”^{||} And in that sublime condensation of the substance of the whole law, given by Moses in Deuteronomy, and repeated by Jesus in the Gospel, the duty of love to God is prefaced by this strict declaration of his unity: “Hear, O Isreal, the Lord our God is ONE Lord.”[¶] Amongst many other express declarations of the Divine Unity in the Sacred Scriptures, it will be sufficient to mention the following: “There is none good but ONE, that is, God.”^{**} “ONE is your Father which is in heaven.”^{††} “There is none other God but ONE.”^{‡‡} “God is ONE.”^{§§} “There is ONE God, and there is none other but He.”^{¶¶} “Thou art the God, even thou ALONE, of all the kingdoms of the earth.”^{***} “I, even I, am He, and

* John xvi. 10.

† Ch. xv. 26; ch. xvi. 7.

‡ Ch. xx. 22.

§ I take this evidence as collected in a tract entitled, *The True Object of Christian Worship Demonstrated, and the Doctrine of the Divine Trinity Elucidated*, &c.; which was formed from a Lecture delivered by me. In the first edition of this work, I only made *references* to the evidence there collected; but on so important a subject, the chief points of it should, certainly be placed before the reader.

|| Exod. xx. 3.

¶ Deut. vi. 4; Mark xii. 29.

** Matt. xix. 17.

†† Ch. xxiii. 9.

‡‡ 1 Cor. viii. 4.

§§ Gal. iii. 20.

¶¶ Mark xii. 32.

*** 2 Kings xix. 15.

there is NO GOD WITH ME.”* I am JEHOVAH,† and there is NONE ELSE.”‡ “In that day JEHOVAH shall be King over all the earth: in that day there shall be ONE JEHOVAH, and his name one.”§.

Nothing in short can be more certainly established by Scripture than the doctrine of the unity of God; nor can there be any doctrine in which reason more thoroughly concurs; and reason, if not capable of discovering divine truths of itself, is yet given to enable us to apprehend them when revealed. Who, then, is the one God, so solemnly presented to the adoration of Christians? The term “God” is the name by which in the present day, the Divine Being is usually designated: but when this sacred name is mentioned, who is the Being that it brings before the mind? *Is there one person in a hundred in whose mind an idea is awakened by it, of the Lord Jesus Christ?* If not, this is a plain proof, that, however exalted a Being some may conceive him to be, they do not fully assent to the belief of his Divinity.

Again, then, let us turn to the Scriptures; and here we shall find, that the texts which affirm the unity of God, are not more decisive, than those which assert *the Divinity of Jesus Christ*.

In what terms does Isaiah announce his birth? “Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon His shoulder: and his name shall be called, Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.”|| John begins his gospel with declaring, that, “in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God;” and this Word he presently informs us, was what “was made flesh.” How does this same Divine Being announce himself, after his glorification or complete union with the Father, to this same apostle in his vision in the isle of Patmos? “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the Ending, saith the Lord, who is, and who was and who is to come, the Almighty.”¶ Here he assumes to himself the most absolute and incommunicable names and attributes of De-

* Deut. xxxii. 39.

† It is to be observed, that, in the English Bible, the term LORD is almost always used instead of the magnificent name expressive of underived Being, JEHOVAH; and the danger of confounding this name with another, which properly signifies Lord, is only guarded against by printing the word Lord in capital letters where it is JEHOVAH in the original. As, however, the name JEHOVAH can be applied to none but the Infinite Deity, whereas the term Lord is applicable also to inferior governors, the former is preserved in the passages above quoted.

‡ Isa. xlv. 5.

§ Zech. xiv. 9.

|| Isa. ix. 6.

¶ Rev. i. 8.

ity, thus verifying the truth of the saying of the apostle Paul, that "being in the form of God, he thought it not robbery to be equal with God;"* on which it may be observed, that if he was in the form of God, and equal with God, it is evident that he could be no other than God himself; since God can have no form but his own form, and no equal but himself. In short, pages might be filled, yea, whole books, with plain proofs from Scripture of the Divinity of the Lord.†

Now, if it is an undeniable truth, in the first place, that God is one; and if it is equally certain, in the second, that Jesus Christ is God; a child may draw the conclusion, that *He is God ALONE*. The two propositions cannot be connected in any other manner. But plain as the conclusion is, lest man should fail to arrive at it, God, in his Word has drawn it for him.

The Lord Jesus Christ has always been acknowledged as the Bridegroom and Husband of his Church,‡ and the Redeemer of his people,§ but the prophet Isaiah, (or rather the Lord by him), addressing the Church, proclaims, "Thy **MAKER** is thy Husband, **JEHOVAH OF HOSTS** is his name; and thy Redeemer is the **HOLY ONE OF ISRAEL**: the **GOD OF THE WHOLE EARTH** shall he be called."|| So in Jeremiah¶ and Hosea,** this distinguishing character of Jesus Christ, that of being the Husband of his Church, is assumed by Jehovah: whence it is plain that the Redeemer, Jesus, is the great Jehovah, the Maker and God of all the earth.

Many other passages, testifying the glorious fact, *that the Creator and Redeemer are the same Divine Person*, and, of course, *that he in whom both characters are united is the only God*, may be adduced from the prophets.

Thus Jehovah says again by Isaiah, "*There is no GOD else beside me: a just GOD and a SAVIOUR, there is none beside me. Look unto me and be ye saved* all the ends of the earth, for *I am GOD and there is none else.*"†† Again: "Thus saith the Lord the King of Israel, and his REDEEMER, **JEHOVAH OF HOSTS**: I am the **FIRST** and I am the **LAST**, and *beside Me, there is no GOD.*"‡‡ "I am **JEHOVAH**, thy God, the Holy One of Israel,

* Philipp. ii. 6.

† See, for instance, Hindmarsh's *Seal on the Lips of all who deny the Supreme Divinity of Jesus Christ*, in which this truth is demonstrated by the evidence of 144 passages selected from the gospels and the Revelation alone.

‡ Matt. ix. 15; xxv. 1, 5, 6; John iii. 29; Rev. xix. 7; xxi. 2, 9; 2 Cor. xi. 2.

§ See Luke xxiv. 21; Gal. iii. 13; 1 Peter i. 18; Rev. v. 9; Eph. i. 7; Heb. ix. 12.

|| Isa. liv. 5.

¶ Chap. xxxi. 32.

** Chap. ii. 2, 7, 18.

†† Isa. xlv. 21, 22.

‡‡ Isa. xlv. 6.

thy SAVIOUR.”* “I, even I am JEHOVAH, and beside me there is no SAVIOUR.”† “Verily thou art *a God that hidest thyself*. O God of Israel, the SAVIOUR.”‡ The God of Israel is here called a God that hideth himself, in reference to his veiling over his infinite Glory with Humanity. “All flesh shall know that I, JEHOVAH am thy SAVIOUR and thy REDEEMER, the Mighty One of Jacob.”§ “Thou shalt know that I, JEHOVAH, am thy SAVIOUR, and thy REDEEMER, the Mighty One of Jacob.”|| “I will help thee, saith JEHOVAH and thy REDEEMER, the Holy One of Israel.”¶ “Thus saith JEHOVAH your REDEEMER, the Holy One of Israel.”** “Thus saith JEHOVAH, thy REDEEMER, and he that formed thee from the womb; I am JEHOVAH that maketh all things, that stretcheth forth the heavens *alone*, that spreadeth abroad the earth *by myself*.”†† “Thus saith JEHOVAH, thy REDEEMER, the Holy One of Israel; I am JEHOVAH thy God.”‡‡ “As for our REDEEMER, JEHOVAH OF HOSTS is *his Name*, the Holy One of Israel.”§§ “Thus saith JEHOVAH, the REDEEMER of Israel, and his Holy One.”||| “With everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee, saith JEHOVAH, thy REDEEMER.”¶¶ “Thou, O JEHOVAH, art our Father, our REDEEMER, thy name is from everlasting.”*** “Their REDEEMER, is strong, JEHOVAH of Hosts is his name.”††† “I am JEHOVAH, thy God from the land of Egypt, and *thou shalt know no God but ME, for there is no SAVIOUR beside ME*.”‡‡‡

As observed above, when the name of God is mentioned, but few apply it in their thoughts to the Lord Jesus Christ, who, nevertheless, is “the true God and eternal life.”§§§ so, on the other hand, when the names Redeemer and Saviour occur, they are seldom considered as belonging to the Infinite Jehovah, but are applied, in idea, to Jesus Christ alone, as a distinct person from Jehovah. That these names properly belong to Jesus Christ, is most certainly true;||||| but that they belong as properly to Jehovah also, the passages above quoted most decidedly demonstrate; either then Jehovah and Jesus must be one and the same Divine Person, or there must be two distinct Saviours and Redeemers. This supposition is too absurd to be entertained by any one, and is also positively contradicted by Ho-

* Isa. xlii. 3.

† Verse 11.

‡ Ch. xiv. 15.

§ Ch. xlix. 26.

|| Ch. lx. 16.

¶ Ch. xli. 14.

** Ch. xlii. 14.

†† Ch. xli. 24.

‡‡ Ch. xlviii. 17.

§§ Ch. xlvii. 4.

||| Ch. xlix. 7.

¶¶ Ch. liv. 8.

*** Ch. lxiii. 16.

††† Jer. i. 84.

‡‡‡ Hos. xiii. 4.

§§§ 1 John v. 20.

||||| Matt. i. 21; Luke ii. 11; John iv. 42; Philp. iii. 20; 1 Tim. i. 15; 2 Tim. i. 10; Titus i. 3, 4; ii. 13; iii. 6. 2 Peter i. 1, 11; ii. 20; iii. 2, 18; 1 John iv. 14.

ly Writ. The prophets affirm, as above, that Jehovah is the *only* Saviour. "I am Jehovah and *beside me* there is *no* Saviour;" "a just God and a Saviour there is *none beside Me*;" but the apostles declare that this character belongs *only* to Jesus, "neither is there salvation in *any other*; for there is *none other name* under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved."† The only way of combining these divinely-inspired declarations is, by regarding them as belonging to the same Divine Being, who is called Jehovah before his assumption of the Human Nature, and Jesus afterwards.

It is, in fact impossible for any evidence to be more clear and conclusive, than that which Scripture bears to this grand truth, '*That Jehovah and Jesus are one and the same Divine Person, the one and only true God.*' The whole Word teems in birth with it from one end to the other. As an angel declares in the Revelation, "the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy."‡

Let the following passages further exhibit what the testimony is which the Scriptures bear respecting Jesus:

That Jesus is Jehovah, is evident from these passages of Moses and the prophets. When Jehovah revealed himself to Moses, it was by a name peculiarly characteristic of Him as the Source of Being; He said, "Thus shalt thou say to the Children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you."§ Jesus assumes the same character; "Before Abraham was I AM."|| Had he simply meant to announce his pre-existence, he would have said I WAS; to say in reference to a prior period, I AM, would be the grossest solecism in the mouth of any but Him who is independent of time, and to whom things which to us are past or future, are eternally present. Isaiah, chap. vi., relates a vision, in which he saw the Lord sitting upon a throne, whilst the seraphim cried, "Holy, holy, holy, is JEHOVAH OF Hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory." The message given to Isaiah on this occasion is quoted in John;¶ and it is there said, "These things spake Esaias, when he saw his glory and spake of Him." *His* and *Him* clearly refer to Jesus, who is thus identified with Him whom the seraphs worship as JEHOVAH OF HOSTS. John was the forerunner of Jesus. All the Evangelists apply to him the prophecy of Isaiah, xl. 3; but the words there are, "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of JEHOVAH." The predictions of Malachi iii. 1, and iv. 5, are also applied* to John; but these also, in the original, speak of one who should go before JEHO-

* Matt. xi. 10, 14.

† Acts iv. 12.

‡ Rev. xix. 10.

§ Ex. iii. 14.

|| John viii. 58,

¶ Ch. xii. 38—41.

VAH. Either, then, Jesus is Jehovah, or these prophecies are wrongly applied to John. All these inferences are sufficiently clear, and might easily be extensively multiplied; but the following passage declares the same truth in the most direct form: "Behold the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will raise unto David a Righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth; in his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is his name whereby he shall be called, JEHOVAH OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS."*

The unity as to Person of Jesus and the Father, may be inferred from innumerable passages in the Evangelists, but in the following it is expressly stated: "I and my Father are ONE."† "He that seeth ME seeth HIM that sent ME."‡ "Jesus saith unto him, I am the Way and the Truth, and the Life: no man cometh to the Father but by me."§ This is a plain declaration, that no one can have any communication with the Father (or Divine Essence), except by approaching him as dwelling in the Son (or Divine Humanity); but to make it still clearer, the Divine Speaker adds, "If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also: and from henceforth ye know him and *have seen him*."|| Plain however as this assertion is, the disciples, like too many of their successors at the present day, did not readily receive it, but still retained an idea of a Divine Being out of, and separate from, Jesus; wherefore "Philip saith unto him, Lord, show us the Father and it sufficeth us."¶ But, in a style that implies reproof for their dullness of apprehension, "Jesus saith unto him, have I been so long time with you, and yet thou hast not known me, Philip? He that hath *seen ME* hath *seen the FATHER*; and how sayest thou then, show us the Father?"** It is impossible to confute, in more decided terms, the error of those who think they can find any real Object of worship out of, and separate from, Jesus, or to show, more clearly, that in Him the whole of the Divine Essence resides and that out of Him nothing of it can be known or apprehended.

The apostles also, in their Epistles continually speak of Jesus in language only applicable to *the Supreme and only God*. "Christ," says St. Paul, "who is over all, God blessed forever."†† "For by Him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in the earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: *all things were created BY him and FOR him*; and He is *before all things*,

* Jer. xxiii. 5, 6.

† John x. 30.

‡ Ch. xii. 45.

§ Ch. xiv. 6.

|| Ver. 7.

¶ Ver. 8.

** Ver. 9.

†† Rom. ix. 5.

and by him *all things consist*.”* Here Creation, Preservation, and Eternal Existence, are ascribed to Jesus Christ; and as there cannot be two Creators, two Preservers, or two Eternals, we may well conclude with Dr. A. Clarke,† that “Jesus Christ is, according to the plain obvious meaning of every expression in this text, truly, properly, independently, and essentially, God.” “Without controversy,” says the same Apostle, “great is the mystery of Godliness. God was *manifest in the flesh*, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.”‡ This passage led Bishop Prettyman Tomline to observe, in his “Elements of Christian Theology,” “Since the six propositions are applicable to Christ, and to Christ alone; and since St. Paul affirms them to be true of God; it follows that Christ is God.” But if any other separate Being be God also, it would not be correct to say that Christ is God, but that he is *a* God; which would shock every pious mind: when, therefore, it is said by St. Paul and the Bishop, that Christ is God, the only legitimate inference is, that he is the Only God. The faithful are required to be “Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.”§ It is allowed by commentators, that the great God and our Saviour are here the same Divine Person, since the Apostle is speaking of the second coming of the Lord, which is not to be an appearing of the Father, but of Jesus Christ. The passage would therefore be more correctly translated, “the glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ;” or “of the Great God, even our Saviour, Jesus Christ.” But how can the supreme Divinity of Jesus be more strongly indicated than by calling him THE GREAT GOD? What blasphemy would it be to apply such an epithet to any subordinate being, how highly-soever exalted! Similar is the testimony of all the other Apostles. James calls Jesus Christ “the Lord of Glory.”|| The Lord of Glory is the same as the King of Glory. And “Who is the King of Glory? JEHOVAH OF HOSTS; HE IS THE KING OF GLORY.”¶ So declares David when speaking of the ascension of Jesus. The prophets of the Old Testament continually declare their revelations to be “the word of JEHOVAH;” but Peter affirms that the Divine communications they received were from Jesus; for speaking of man’s salvation, he says, “of which salvation the prophets have enquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace which should come unto you; searching what, or what manner of time, THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST, *which was in them*,

* Col. i. 16, 17.

§ Tit. ii. 13.

† Sermon on Acts xvi. 31.

|| Eph. ii. 1.

‡ 1 Tim. iii. 16.

¶ Ps. xxiv. 10.

did signify, when It testified before hand the sufferings of Christ and the glory which should follow.”* It is plain then that the Word of Jehovah is by the Spirit of Christ, thus that Christ is another name for Jehovah. John in his Epistles, affirms Jesus Christ to be God, not only in the passage quoted above, but also when he says, “Hereby we perceive the love of God because He laid down his life for us.”† Jude openly declares him to be God alone, when he concludes his Epistle with saying, “To the ONLY WISE GOD, OUR SAVIOUR, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever, Amen.” Well might Bishop Burnet, after noticing some of the above passages, with others, remark “Idolatry and a plurality of Gods, seem to be the main things that the scriptures warn us against: and yet here is a pursued thread of passages and discourses, that do naturally lead a man to think that Christ is the true God.” Can any see the truth of this observation, and fail to conclude, that since “Christ is the true God,” in him so completely “dwells ALL the fullness of the Godhead bodily,” that to worship any supposed God *out of* HIM, must be a species of that idolatry against which the Scriptures mainly warn us!

To proceed to the crown of prophecy — the Revelation of John. *We here find Supreme Divinity ascribed to JESUS CHRIST* in language, which, if not more clear, is more commanding, than that in which the same truth is expressed elsewhere. One passage has been quoted above: the following are a few more.

First, it is to be observed, that, in the prophets, Jehovah repeatedly describes his own Being by calling himself the First and the Last. “I am the First, I also am the Last.”‡ Certainly, no epithet can more appropriately describe the nature of Him who is the origin and End, the All in All, of every thing that exists; but, in the Revelation, Jesus assumes this incommunicable name as his own. When John was in the spirit on the Lord’s day he heard behind him a great voice as of a trumpet, saying, I AM ALPHA AND OMEGA THE FIRST AND THE LAST.”§ John turned to see the voice which spake with him; when he saw “One like unto the Son of Man.”|| And to remove from his mind any doubt whether the voice he had heard, announcing the divine character of the Speaker in such decided terms, proceeded from the Being whom he now saw and whom he recognized as the Son of man — the Lord Jesus Christ, this benificent Saviour, at the sight of whose majesty John had fallen at his feet as dead, laid his right hand upon

* 1 Eph. i. 10, 11.

† 1 John iii. 16.

‡ Is. xlviii. 12; see also ch. xli. 4, and the other passage quoted above, xliv. 6.

§ Rev. 1. 11.

|| Ver. 13.

him, saying unto him, "Fear not, **I AM THE FIRST AND THE LAST.**"* The Lord Jesus Christ again describes himself by this title in his address to the Church of Smyrna; to which he says, "These things saith **THE FIRST AND THE LAST**, which was dead and is alive."† And again, at the conclusion of the book, when announcing his second coming, he says, "Behold I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be. **I AM ALPHA AND OMEGA, THE BEGINNING AND THE END, THE FIRST AND THE LAST.**"‡ The Lamb, so often mentioned in the Revelation, is acknowledged to represent the Lord Jesus Christ; it represents him as to his Human Nature, whilst He who was seen sitting upon the throne, denotes him as to his Divine Essence; and we read that they who gave their power to the beast, "shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them; for **HE IS LORD OF LORDS AND KING OF KINGS.**"§ And again; He who was seen|| on a white horse, and whose name is called the Word of God, is manifestly a representative of the Lord Jesus Christ; and of him also it is said, that "He hath on his vesture and on his thigh, a name written, **KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS.**"¶ Is it possible to express supreme dominion in more emphatic terms? Must it not be true, as is also expressly declared, that to Jesus Christ belong "glory and dominion, forever and ever."***

These selections from the Revelation, establishing the identity of Jesus and Jehovah, shall be concluded with some passage from the same book, which prove that *all divine worship should be addressed to Jesus Christ, both as to his Essential Divinity and his Divine Humanity.*

We read†† that the "four and twenty elders [denoting the superior angelic powers] fall down before Him that sat on the throne, and worship Him forever and ever, and cast their crowns before the throne, saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honor, and power; for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are, and were created." In the next chapter‡‡ we are informed, that the four and twenty elders *fell down before the Lamb*; after which myriads of myriads, and thousands of thousands of angels worshiped him, in terms only differing in their greater fullness from those in which the elders had, in the former chapter, worshipped Him who sat on the throne; for they said, "Worthy is **THE LAMB** that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing."§§ After which, united

* Ver. 17. † Ch. iv. 8. ‡ Ch. xxii. 12, 13. § Ch. xvii. 14. || Ch. xix.

¶ Ver. 16. ** Ch. i. 6. †† Rev. iv. 10, 11. ‡‡ Ver. 8. §§ Ver. 12.

and equal worship was given to Him that sat on the throne and to the Lamb; for John says, "Every creature which is in Heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I, saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever."* But are we to imagine that these are two distinct Divine Beings? If we confine our ideas strictly to the literal expressions, we may indeed form such a conception; but then, to heighten the absurdity, we must suppose that one of them is actually in the form of a lamb. This alone ought to convince us that two separate persons are not meant. For can we conceive, that when angels are favored with a sight of the Object of worship, they in reality see two, one sitting upon a throne, and the other in the form of a lamb, "in the midst of the throne"?† Surely not. But when the angels are favored with the beatific vision, they behold their God in one single Person and in a Divine Human Form, and are penetrated at once with the deepest feelings of adoration both to the Divine Essence and to the Divine Humanity, in, and by which latter, the former is rendered apprehensible to them as an object of sight and worship. This combined perception of Divinity and Humanity which angels experience on the sight of their Lord, could not be expressed in natural language, without the use of much circumlocution and definition, which is a style quite foreign to that in which the scriptures are written, and wholly unsuited to be the vehicle of that fullness of wisdom with which they are replete. The Scripture style consists in expressing spiritual ideas by the use of natural images; by which means the most extensive amplitude of meaning is conveyed in a few words. It is literally true, that if all that is contained in the Scriptures were given in the style used in ordinary compositions, "Even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written."‡ It is thus that, instead of diffusely speaking of the Essential Divinity and Divine Humanity, as *we* are obliged to do in offering our explanations, the Scriptures here simply speak of "Him that sitteth on the throne and the Lamb," in which brief expressions more is implied than the most intelligent of the angelic hosts will ever be able to exhaust. But to prevent even the weak among mankind from being misled by this emblematic mode of expression, the truth shines through it with sufficient lucidity to enlighten the minds of all who do not prefer to abide in darkness. Thus, in the present instance, mention is first made of the worship, by the angelic hosts, of Him that sat upon the throne; presently, the very same adoration is given to the Lamb; next, both are

* Ver. 18.

† See ver. 6.

‡ John. xxi. 25.

worshiped *distinctly* together; and lastly, both are worshiped *unitedly* together; for the chapter concludes with saying, "and the four and twenty elders fell down and worshiped Him that liveth forever and ever; where it is evident that the phrase, "Him that liveth forever and ever," denotes the same Divine Being, viewed perfectly as One, as had been called in the preceding verse, in reference to his first two Essentials, "Him that sitteth upon the throne and the Lamb." That this epithet, "*He that liveth forever and ever*," is meant to include both the first Essentials of the Divine Nature, is clear from its being elsewhere applied to each of them distinctly. We have seen in a former quotation, that He that sat on the throne is called "He that liveth forever and ever;"* in another instance, Jesus Christ takes the same title: for he says,† "I am he that liveth, and was dead, and behold, I am alive for ever more:" where the words translated "alive for ever more," are, in the original Greek, the same as are elsewhere translated "He that liveth forever and ever." These remarks may serve to explain other passages in which the Divine Being is spoken of in terms which imply duality or triplicity; in all such instances we are not to understand a duality or triplicity of persons, but of Essential Principles in the Divine Nature, constituting together One Person.

Thus we find, from an attention to the Old and New Testaments in all their parts, THAT JESUS IS JEHOVAH; THAT HE AND THE FATHER ARE ONE, INSOMUCH THAT WHOSO SEETH HIM SEETH THE FATHER; THAT HE IS OVER ALL, GOD BLESSED FOREVER; THAT HE IS THE CREATOR AND SUSTAINER OF ALL THINGS BY AND FOR HIMSELF; THAT HE IS GOD MANIFEST IN THE FLESH THAT HE IS THE GREAT GOD, THE LORD OF GLORY, THE INSPIRER OF THE PROPHETS, THE ONLY WISE GOD; THAT HE IS THE FIRST AND THE LAST; AND THAT, WITH RESPECT TO HIS HUMANITY AS WELL AS HIS DIVINITY, HE IS THE OBJECT OF WORSHIP OF ALL THE ANGELIC HOSTS. Can we then hesitate to admit, that the testimony and spirit of all prophecy respecting Him is, that HE IS THE SUPREME AND ONLY DIVINE BEING? Can any one fear to imitate the conduct of Thomas, when his incredulity was removed, and with a fullness of acknowledgment that excludes the possibility of thinking of any other cry to Him from the bottom of his heart, "MY LORD AND MY GOD!"‡

Since then the doctrine of the Sole Divinity of Jesus Christ, is alike free from the objections which reason urges against the Tri-personal system, and from the contrariety to Scripture which is manifest in the Unitarian scheme, with what confi-

* Ch. iv. 10.

† Ch. i. 18.

‡ John xx, 28.

dence may it be recommended, and with what delight should it be received, as the only view of divine truth capable of relieving the mind from all perplexity ! Whilst it delivers us from the anarchy and contradictions of Tritheism, it preserves to us all the consolation conveyed in the idea of a Divine Saviour. It removes all obscurity, all room for doubt, and presents us with an Object of worship, on which the understanding can fix itself, and which the heart can embrace with all its best affections.

SECTION VII.

THE TRINITY, AS CENTERED IN THE PERSON OF THE LORD
JESUS CHRIST.

PART II.

All Objections to the Doctrine fall to the ground, when certain Truths are known relating to the Lord as the Son of God, and the Glorification of his Humanity.

THE grand truth of the Sole Divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ, — or that he is Jehovah clothed with Humanity, and that the Father and He are strictly One, has been, I trust, abundantly proved from Scripture ; whence it necessarily follows, that the whole Trinity is centered in his Glorious Person. Doubts, however, may remain in the minds of some, unless they are made acquainted with certain other truths requisite for the elucidation of these very general ones, and capable of taking away the grounds of all the objections which can be raised against the doctrine. By presenting these, I trust we shall again, though by a different route, arrive at complete proof of the doctrine itself.

The objections to the doctrine that the whole Divine Trinity is centered in the Lord Jesus Christ, whose Person is thus the person of the Father, are chiefly drawn from these two sources : FIRST, from the belief, that the Being who became incarnate was a son of God born from eternity ; here, therefore, I shall endeavor to show, that the phrase, “ *Son of God,*” is the proper title of the Humanity born in time, and that the Being who assumed that Humanity was the One Jehovah : SECONDLY, objections are raised from the fact, that Jesus Christ, while in the world, sometimes spoke as if the Father were a separate Being from Himself : here, therefore, I shall endeavor to show, That

while in the world, he was engaged in the work of glorifying his Humanity, or making it Divine, as part of his great work of Redemption : Thus that so long as he was in the world there was a part of his nature which was not divine ; but that the work of glorifying the whole was completed at his resurrection and ascension ; that all belonging to him had then been made divine ; and that thus he now ever liveth and reigneth, with the Father, an Indivisible One, the Only God of Heaven and earth. When these truths are seen, the ground of all the objections which can plausibly be raised against the doctrine, that the whole Trinity is centered in his Glorious Person will be taken away.

I. I am then, FIRST, to meet the objections arising out of the belief, that the Being who became Incarnate was a Son of God born from eternity, by showing, *that the phrase, " Son of God," is the proper title of the Humanity born in time, and that the Being who assumed it was that One Jehovah.*

The idea of a Son of God *born from eternity* includes such a contradiction in terms, that if those who entertain it will pardon the remark, we may well wonder how it could have ever found a propounder ; especially, when, on searching the Scriptures, we discover that nothing whatever countenancing such a notion is there to be found. Had there been such a being as a Son of God existing from eternity, governing the universe in conjunction with his Father, and the head and particular Ruler of the church, is it to be supposed, that the church could have been left, for four thousand years, in total ignorance of his existence ? Yet such is incontrovertibly the fact. The Old Testament, which contains the records of all the churches that ever appeared on this globe, from the creation till the coming of the Lord, never once speaks of a son of God as then actually existing : It speaks indeed, prophetically, of a son of God who, in the fullness of time was *to be* born, but never makes the slightest allusion to a Son of God then born already.

The translators of the English Bible have, indeed, once used the term in such a manner, as might lead the uninformed to imagine there was a proper son of God in the days of Daniel. For when Nebuchadnezzar had caused the three pious Jews to be cast into the furnace, he is represented as saying, " Lo, I see four men, loose, walking in the midst of the fire ; and the form of the fourth is *like the Son of God.*"* But it is certain that the words of the original Chaldee, in which language this part of the Scripture is written, ought to be rendered "*a son of the Gods ;*" and this is now admitted by all the learned ; while it certainly is much more suitable to the character of the

* Ch. iii. 25.

speaker, Nebuchadnezzar a polytheist, and a worshipper of idols. Even the Chaldee term for God, when in the plural number, will bear, like the Hebrew term, a singular meaning, still there is no ground whatever for calling the heavenly stranger whom the king saw, "*the* Son of God, but he ought to be termed "*a* Son of God;" in the same sense, according to a remark of the commentators, as the epithets, *godlike*, *divine*, &c., are applied by Homer to some of his heroes. — Indeed, if the ancient Jews could have had an idea like that now entertained, of a Son of God from eternity, it still would be the height of inconsistency to make the heathen Nebuchadnezzar, who knew no more of the principles of the Jewish religion than he did of the modern Christian notions of the Trinity, speak according to such notions. Certain it is that the prophet Daniel, who writes this history, had no intention of making him do so; on the contrary, he represents him as saying, a little below,* "*Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, who hath sent his angel and delivered his servants.*" And, no doubt, the being sent to protect the faithful Jews *was* an angel, and is called *a son of God*, or, according to the creed of Nebuchadnezzar, *a son of the Gods*, in the same sense as angels are called *Sons of God* in Scripture. This is in fact acknowledged in the margin of the common bible, which at ver. 25, for the illustration of the phrase, "*son of God*," refers us to Job i. 6; where we read, "*Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord.*" These obviously, are the angels: and one of these *sons of God*, and not a proper son of God born from eternity, was doubtless the *son of God* seen by Nebuchadnezzar. It is greatly to be lamented, that so very important a mis-translation should remain in the English Bible to mislead the simple. — Printed too, as it is, with the word "*Son*" commenced with a capital letter, none who are destitute of other means of information can avoid supposing that there was a proper Son of God then existing; while no shadow of ground really exists for such an imagination.

Seeing then that Moses and the prophets give us no information about a proper Son of God as existing when that part of the Divine Code was composed, we must come to the New Testament for instruction: where the term is often used, and always in reference to the Lord Jesus Christ. Of all the places in which it here occurs, perhaps that in Luke i. 35, is best adapted to convey a full insight into its meaning. It is there applied by the angel Gabriel to the Lord Jesus Christ at

* Ver. 28.

his birth, or rather, prior to his birth, in a manner which plainly intimates that there was no Son of God before. In the other gospels, this epithet is given to Jesus Christ, or is assumed by him: but in this passage of Luke we learn the origin of the title, and the reason of it. Had there been a Son of God already existing, and it was this which became incarnate and was born of the virgin, we undoubtedly should have had some intimation of it when the angel announced to her the approaching event. He surely would have made some mention of the Being who was about to assume Humanity by her means. He would not merely have told her, that that Holy Thing which *should* be born of her *should* be called *the Son of God*; but, that *the son of God who had existed from eternity, was about, by her instrumentality, to come into the world.* No such thing. He says: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also *that Holy Thing* which *shall* be born of thee *shall* be called *the Son of God.* Here is express mention of the *Holy Ghost*, and of the *Highest* or *Father*, as operating in the divine conception: but nothing is said of a Son from eternity as being in any way concerned; and the omission most plainly implies, what all the perceptions of common sense must be outraged before we can doubt, that the Son does not assist to produce himself, nor exist before he is born. The *Holy Thing* that *was to be* born, it is said, *should* be called *the Son of God*; and so called, not because it had already been born from eternity, but *because*, (what else does the illative particle, "*therefore*," intend?—because) it was *now first conceived* of the Holy Ghost and the Father.

Here, also, is another circumstance which it is impossible for the tri-personalist to reconcile with his creed: that the Holy Ghost as well as the Highest or Father, is represented as standing in the relation of a parent to the Son of God. It is commonly believed, that the Holy Ghost is a distinct personal being, separate from both the Father and the Son; if so, then, according to the angel Gabriel, the Son had two distinct Fathers. The Athanasian creed says, that "the Son is of the Father *alone*, neither made nor created, but begotten; but the angel Gabriel positively declares, that the Son is of the Holy Ghost *and* the Highest, begotten alike of both. How evident then it is, that, before we can have clear and consistent notions of the Divine Incarnation, we must not only dismiss from our minds the wild belief of a Son of God, born from eternity, but also that equally extravagant and unscriptural notion, the separate personality of the Holy Ghost.

How inconsistent and perplexing (may we not exclaim?) are such conceptions! How embarrassing and distressing would they be to those who entertain them, would they venture steadily to look at them! but this they dare not; for they feel that disbelief, which they dread as connected with perdition, must supervene, were they suffered to be made the subject of reflection. Inquiry therefore, is silenced with the incessant cry, "*It is a mystery*, altogether beyond human comprehension." Thus the author of the *Anti-Swedenborg* occupies four pages* with the repetition of this cry, and with endeavors to prove, that ignorance in regard to the Object of their worship is the special privilege of Christians. And he here only follows the example of his superiors. The celebrated lexicographer, Johnson, defines the word "Trinity" to mean, "the *incomprehensible union* of the three Divine Persons of the Godhead;" and Bishop Tomline, in his *Elements of Christian Theology*, though he clearly proves the existence of a Trinity, and conclusively establishes the Divinity of Jesus Christ, yet, because he assumes the Trinity to consist of three separate Persons, repeatedly avows their *Unity* to be *Incomprehensible*. Thus it is not the *Trinity* which the advocates of this creed affirm to be incomprehensible: they evidently have quite distinct notions of three distinct beings; for, admit a plurality of Gods to be possible, and there is no difficulty in conceiving the precise number to be three: but how to conceive that, nevertheless, these *three* are but *one*,—*hic labor, hoc opus est!* They justly apply, therefore, the epithet "*incomprehensible*," not to the Trinity, which they acknowledge in fact, but to the *Unity*, which they only profess in words. Hence they tell us that we must not think about it, because it is *a mystery*. But pardon me if I ask, whether, when they who ought to be in the light of the gospel excuse their confused notions by the cry of "*Mystery!*" they do not, in reality acknowledge that they are not the true disciples of Jesus Christ? To *his* disciples the Lord says "To you it is given *to know the mystery* of the kingdom of God; but unto *them that are without*, all these things are done in parables: that seeing they may see and *not perceive*, and hearing they may hear and *not understand*."† In another Evangelist, it is, "*the mysteries* of the kingdom of Heaven."‡ And in reference to this very subject, the Lord says elsewhere, "the time cometh when I shall no more speak to you in proverbs, but I shall show you, *plainly* of the Father."§ But the advocates of the common notions affirm, not only that this promise never has been, but that it never will be fulfilled; that any *plain* knowl-

* Pp. 21 — 23.

† Mark iv. 11, 12.

‡ Matt. xiii. 11.

edge of the Father, as one of the characters of the Trinity, is utterly unattainable; that the whole is an incomprehensible *mystery*, which we are not so much as, with the angels, to *desire* to look into.*

The whole subject, however loses its imputed character of incomprehensibility, and becomes, agreeably to the divine promise just cited, plain; and the words of the angel Gabriel, in particular, become easy to understand; when we know that the Trinity in the Divine Nature does not consist of three Persons, but of three Principles or Elements in one Person. "*The Highest*," which is the term used by the angel instead of "the Father," most clearly denotes the *Inmost* Principle of Deity, or the *Essence* of the Divine Nature. Unquestionably, God is not called the Highest or Most High, in reference to any station which he occupies in space; for God is independent of space, and no more stationed in one place than in another. He who is Omnipresent, cannot literally be either high or low. The reason then of his title of Most High is, because he is the Inmost, being everywhere present as the inmost source of the life and existence of all things. And with respect to the three Essentials of his own Nature, it must be his Inmost Divinity which is called the Highest. So, when elsewhere, this Inmost Principle is called the Father, it is because the *Essence* of Deity is Love, and Love is the Great Parent of all. The Holy Ghost or Holy Spirit, in like manner, is not a separate Person, but is the Divine Emanation of influences and energies proceeding from the Divine Being, by which all things are kept in existence, and especially by which the graces of Heavenly life are imparted to human minds. Much the same is meant by *the Power* of the highest as by the Holy Spirit; for as the Highest denotes the Divine Essence, so the Power of the Highest denotes the influence and operation thence proceeding; only there is this difference in the import of the two phrases; that the Holy Spirit means the Divine Emanation of Life and influence more with respect to the Divine Truth and Wisdom, and the Power of the Highest is the same Divine Emanation more with reference to the Divine Goodness and Love. What then can be "that Holy Thing," "the Son of God," conceived by the energy of these two Principles within the sphere of Humanity, but themselves, and consequently the Highest with them brought into open manifestation, concentrated in a Divine Human Form and thus adapted to be an Object both of the love and the perceptions of finite and infirm human minds?

The consequence of this assumption of Humanity by Jeho

* 1 Peter i. 12.

vah, was, the redemption of mankind, by the subjugation of the powers of hell, which could not otherwise have been approached and conquered; and the communication of saving energies for the restoration of fallen man, with an efficacy which could no otherwise be obtained. But respecting this part of the subject we shall have occasion to say more in the Section on the Atonement.

It may be necessary to observe, that we are not to conclude from the fact, that there was no son of God, born from eternity, that, therefore, there was no Trinity from eternity. Though there was not such a Trinity as since the incarnation, there must always have been a Divine Essence, a Divine Form and a Divine Influencing Power. As the Divine Essence is identical with the purely Divine Love, the Divine Form is identical with the purely Divine Truth which is the Word, of which it is said in the beginning of John that it was made flesh, or assumed the ultimate form of existence. The state of the Divine Trinity before the assumption of Humanity, or before the birth of the Son of God, is compared, by Swedenborg, to the state of an angel or spirit; who has a soul or inmost principle of life, a spiritual body, and a sphere of operation thence; but the state of the Divine Trinity since the assumption of Humanity, is compared to the state of a man in the world, in whom his soul and spiritual body are clothed with a natural body also, and thus have a sphere of activity in the world of nature.

We may now have advanced as much as was necessary to elucidate this branch of our argument. We were to meet the objections arising out of the belief, that the Being who became incarnate was a Son of God born from eternity, by showing that the phrase, Son of God, is the proper title of the Humanity born in time, and that the Being who assumed it was the One Jehovah. This has, I trust, sufficiently appeared; and with it, we have in some degree seen, how much light the view proposed throws upon the great doctrine of the Trinity.

II. I am next to meet the objections which are raised from the fact, that the Lord Jesus Christ, while in the world, sometimes spoke as if the Father were a Being separate from himself. To this end I am to show, *That, while in the world, he was engaged in the work of glorifying his Humanity, or making it Divine, which was part of his great work of Redemption: thus, That so long as he was in the world there was a part of his nature which was not Divine, but that the work of glorifying the whole was completed at his resurrection and ascension; that all belonging to him had then been made Divine;*

and that now he ever liveth and reigneth, with the Father, an Indivisible One, the Only Holy God of Heaven and Earth.

A psychological fact is necessary to be premised.

It is supposed by many, that nothing is derived by man from his parents except his bodily frame, and that when this has arrived to a certain stage of its growth in the womb, a soul, immediately created for the purpose, is infused into it from God. This notion involves such contradictions, that it is wonderful how any can admit it. How can the human race at the present day be infected with the sin of Adam, as is generally supposed; and how can there be a transmission of mental disposition and character from ancestors, as experience demonstrates to be the fact; if as to the only part of us which is capable either of sin, or righteousness, or mental character, we are not Adam's descendants, and have no proper ancestors, but are as much original creations as was Adam himself. How much more rational is Swedenborg's doctrine; that the soul is not an independent principle that lives of itself, but is a spiritual form organized for the reception, from moment to moment, of life from God; which life is received and modified by it according to the peculiar character of the form; the form itself being propagated from the parents, and thus resembling what it was in them, as is the case with the body! Many philosophers have seen that such must be the fact. Watts endeavored to combine both opinions; in which he succeeds in establishing the truth much better than in sheltering the error. "Though the spirit of man," says he, "be incorporeal, and is created by God without depraved or sinful qualities in it," [here is the error: how does it agree with the truth that follows?] "yet it never exists, or comes into being, but as a part of human nature; and that *not as a piece of new workmanship, but as a part of mankind propagated from parents, by the continued power of God's creating word, 'be fruitful and multiply.'*"*

Now be it observed, that there was this difference between the Lord Jesus Christ, while in a body of flesh on earth, and all ordinary men: that whereas they take their soul or spiritual part from a human father, as well as their body or material part from a human mother, and thus are finite human beings as to both, Jesus Christ, having no Father but the Divine Father, had his Soul or internal part from the Divine Essence; and as the Divine Essence is obviously incapable of division, the Divine Essence Itself, or the Father, was in fact his soul or internal part; while his body or external part, including the affections, &c. of the natural man, was all that he took from the mother. So long as he had attached to him this body from

* Works, vol. ii. p. 322.

the mother, he was necessarily an inhabitant of this material world ; nor could he return, as he expresses it in John, to the Father, and “be glorified with the glory which he had with him,” — as the Divine Truth or Word in union with the Divine Good or Love, — “before the world was,”* until his external part, even to the very body, by the assumption of which “the Word was made flesh,”† was glorified or made Divine : nor, till then, was the whole Humanity the appropriate Divine Form of the Divine Essence that was resident within, and which was continually endeavoring to bring it into a state of perfect agreement with itself, that it might impart itself to it, and thus dwell in fulness in it, as the soul in its body. Thus our Lord’s state by birth bore an exact analogy to man’s state by birth. Man has, we know, an internal man and an external man, which are by birth in opposition to each other, the internal man inclining to heavenly things and the external only to earthly things ; wherefore man, before he can be elevated to heaven, must be regenerated, that is, his external man must be formed anew, so as to become the image of the internal, and to incline, like it, to heavenly things, and only to earthly in subordination to heavenly. But that which, in our Lord, may be called his internal man, was Jehovah, or the Essential Divinity itself ; but his external man, being taken from a human parent, was at first merely human and finite, and partook of human, finite and earthly things ; wherefore, before the Lord could return to complete oneness with the Father, his external man was to be formed anew, so as to become the exact image of his internal, thus like it, Divine and Infinite. Now this renewal of his external part was going on during the whole course of his life in the world.

That the Lord was not born Divine as to his external part, but only as to his internal part, is generally known : but that he was continually engaged in rendering his external part Divine also, which at last was completely effected, is as generally overlooked. That as to his external man, he advanced in intelligence as well as in bodily growth, is evident from the declaration of Luke, that, when a child, “Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man ;”‡ where by his increasing in favor with God and man, is meant his approximation to union with his Divinity, and his reception of Divine principles from his Divine Essence in his Humanity. The same truth is further evident from the circumstance, that he is stated to have been about thirty years old before he entered on his public ministry. This is a fact which cannot possibly be accounted for on any principles but ours. Can it be sup-

* John xvii. 5.

† Ch. i. 14.

‡ Ch. ii. 52.

posed that these thirty years, of the history of which only two or three particulars are recorded, were spent by him in doing nothing? Would a Divine Being have remained so long in a body taken from the elements of this world, were there not a gradual process going on essential to the accomplishment of the work for which he came into this world, and previous to the arrival at a certain stage of which he was not in a capacity of working those miracles, and of speaking those words of eternal Truth, by which his public career was distinguished? — When he had so far advanced to oneness with the Father that his external man, by which he spoke and acted in the world, was open even to him, that is was in immediate communication with his Divine Essence, (of which the descent of the dove at his baptism, as a symbol of the Holy Spirit, or Divine Life, flowing into him immediately from his Divine Essence, was the token), he went about the world performing the wonderful works which are recorded of him; and when his external man was perfectly united with the Father, thus was rendered Divine by the full reception of the Divine Essence in all its faculties, he appeared on earth no longer, but ascended up into heaven,* “and sat on the right hand of God.”† By this phrase is not meant that he literally sat down by the side of another Divine Person; but, as the hand is the part of the body by which all of its powers are exerted, it is always used in the Word to signify power; as is also the practice in many eastern nations at the present day: hence by the right hand of God is signified by Divine Omnipotence, to the possession of which the Lord as to his Human Nature, was now exalted: as he says himself, in reference to the same subject in Matthew, “All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.”‡ “ALL power” is Omnipotence: by “ME,” he means the Human Nature, to which were now *given*, that is, communicated, all the attributes of the Essential Divinity, rendering it a perfect One therewith.

We are now in possession of every thing that is requisite to the solution of all the objections to the doctrine of the sole Divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ, which are drawn from the fact, that, while in the world, he sometimes spoke as if the Father were a Being separate from himself. So long as he was in the world, we have seen there was a part of his nature which was not Divine: and so far as the sphere of his thoughts descended into it, he would have a sense of separate existence. Thus there are various occasions on which Jesus is recorded to have prayed to the Father, and at sometimes with the greatest distress and anxiety; the reason of which was, because he was

* See also above, pp. 17, 18. † Mark xvi. 19. ‡ Matt. xxviii. 18.

then in his state of humiliation, or the sphere of his consciousness was chiefly in the infirm Humanity taken from the mother ; and, being engaged in combats with the infernal hosts, these at such times prevailed so far as to shut out the perception of communication with his Divine Essence, and to occasion doubt, to his unglorified human nature, whether its union therewith could ever be effected, and, of consequence, whether the salvation of the human race, which depended upon that union, could be accomplished. Man, in his Christian progress, undergoes states in some degree similar. He cannot always be kept in a state of elevation, — in the perception of those heavenly principles which he has received by the internal man from the Lord ; but he sometimes sinks into the external man merely, and finds himself there so beset with impressions opposite to heavenly ones, as to be brought to doubt whether he has ever really received anything of a heavenly nature or not. Such also was the case with our Lord ; except that his internal part was not only, as with others, formed by principles of goodness and truth received from the Divine Being, but Divine Goodness and Truth themselves ; and that, in his external part, he had to combat with the whole infernal host, under forms of horror and overwhelming terror that would infallibly have destroyed any merely finite being — any man whose soul was any other than Divinity itself. No wonder, then if, when in such states, he sometimes appeared at a distance from his Father, and prayed to him in a manner that might lead us to regard the Father as a Being different from himself ! At other times, he gives thanks to the Father ; which, though not implying so great an idea of distance as in the former case, still conveys to the uninformed mind, an idea of separation. To give thanks to the Lord, in the language of Scripture, implies an acknowledgment, that all that we receive, which is the subject of our thanks, is from him. This also is the meaning when Jesus gives thanks to the Father ; he acknowledges by the action, that it is from his Divine Essence, that Divine Love, Wisdom, and Life, are imparted to his Humanity. Our Lord, accordingly, constantly declares that he does nothing of himself, “ but that the Father that dwelleth in him, he doeth the works ;” * by which he instructs us, that his Humanity alone, were it separate from his Divinity, would be powerless, but that by union with the Divinity it has Omnipotence. This may be clearly illustrated by the case of the soul and body of man ; the body separate from the soul would be a mass of dead matter ; but in union with the soul it has all the power of the soul in it : nay, further, the soul, without the body would have no power whatever in this world

* John xiv. 10.

of nature to which the body belongs ; and just so, when man had sunk into a merely natural state, the divine influences were rendered incapable of affecting him in a saving manner, till they had invested themselves with the requisite instrument, by clothing themselves with a Humanity capable of making them felt in that sphere of life in which man then stood. It would, however, be absurd, because the body has nothing but what it receives from the soul, to regard the body as a distinct person from the soul ; nor is it less so, because all the power of the Lord's Humanity is a consequence of the Divinity's dwelling within it, to consider it as a distinct person from the Father. Accordingly, it was only while the work of glorification was in progress, that Jesus either prayed to the Father or gave him thanks. After it was accomplished, he never did either the one or the other ; but although, for the sake of conveying the notion of Divinity and Humanity in the Lord, distinct mention continues to be made of the Son and of the Father, both in the gospels after the resurrection and in the Apocalypse throughout, *there is no hint whatever of any address from the one to the other.* Only let this fact be fairly looked at, and it must be seen to be decisive. From the period of the resurrection, there is no hint whatever of any address of any kind, from the Son to the Father or from the Father to the Son ; all trace of inferiority on the part of the Son disappears ; the angelic hosts, with equal reverence, sing "Blessing and honor, glory and power, be unto Him that sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever." The reason is, because, the union between them being fully accomplished, all the Divine Essence belongs equally to the Humanity, and the Humanity is the perfect form and adequate instrument of action of the Divine Essence. While this work was in progress only, our Lord prayed and gave thanks to the Father — ascribed all to him : but after its accomplishment he does so no longer, because there is no longer anything in him which is not absolutely one with the Father : on the contrary, he now assumes to himself the most absolute and incommunicable of the Father's attributes ; as when he says, "I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the Ending, the First and the Last, who is, who was, and who is to come, the Almighty."

Thus, when it is known that there was no Son of God born from eternity, but this is the proper title of the Humanity born in time ; and when it is known that this Humanity, though not Divine when born, was rendered such by a process which it was undergoing during the whole period of our Lord's existence on earth. It is obvious that all objections to the doctrine of the New Church respecting the Divine Trinity, as concentrated in

the Glorified or Divine Person of the Lord Jesus Christ, fall completely to the ground ; and we see how it is true, that notwithstanding his having appeared in the form of an ordinary man in the world, — in a form which was liable to infirmities, to sufferings, and to death, — he now ever liveth and reigneth with the Father, an Indivisible One, the only God of Heaven and Earth.

SECTION VII.

THE TRINITY AS CENTERED IN THE PERSON OF THE LORD
JESUS CHRIST.

PART III.

Tritheism the Alternative of the True Doctrine of the Trinity.

ABUNDANT proof has been now given, in the preceding PARTS of this SECTION, as I Trust will be acknowledged by the Candid and the Reflecting, of the grand doctrine of the New Church which we believe to be prefigured by the New Jerusalem in the Revelation, — that the whole Divine Trinity is centered in the single Glorious Person of the Lord Jesus Christ. Copious stores of Scripture evidence have been adduced, directly establishing his Sole Divinity ; and such explanations of particular parts of the Doctrine have been offered, as indirectly establish the same truth, and take away the ground of all the objections that can plausibly be raised against it. Virtually then, every objection advanced by the writer, whom, in this work, I principally follow, and by all other adversaries, has already been answered. Every difficulty that has ever been raised has in effect been solved, and all further refutation is unnecessary. Nevertheless, as I wish every thing to be fully met that is advanced by the author of the Anti-Swedenborg, whose objections and arguments are the same as those of other assailants, of all of whom he may be taken as the representative ; I will specifically apply the principles already developed to the solution of the difficulties which he has attempted to raise. The result if I do not grossly mismanage the discussion, cannot fail to be the more irrefragable establishment of the truth ; for how can the genuine truth, — that the whole Trinity is centered in the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ, be more powerfully corroborated, than when it is seen that its only real alternative is the doctrine of Tritheism, or the avowal of the existence of three distinct Gods ? The only way in which the doctrine of the Sole Divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ, and, consequently.

the concentration of the Trinity in his single Person, can be evaded, is, either by denying the Trinity altogether, and affirming his simple humanity, as is done by Unitarians; or, if a Trinity be acknowledged, by regarding the three subjects of it, the three Divine Persons, as they are commonly called, as three distinct Gods. The writer whom I here follow, with all the numerous class of whom he is the legitimate representative, sometimes, to avoid the acknowledgement of the Lord's Sole Divinity, argues like those who assert his mere humanity; and it is perfectly evident, that, with all his suffragans, he views the Lord's Humanity as not essentially differing from that of an ordinary man. He allows him however, to be a Divine Being, as well; but, as God, he denies him to be the same God as either the Father or the Holy Ghost. He openly avows in everything but the name, the doctrine of Tritheism; and his observations are such as clearly evince, that this is the only refuge which remains open to those, who, asserting a Trinity, insist that it is a Trinity of separate Persons, and deny that it is centered in the single Person of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The avowal of Tritheism is most plainly made by this opponent, in his endeavors to elude the force of the three texts, on which, as he represents the matter, our doctrine of the Sole Divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ is founded. The true meaning of these texts, therefore, shall be vindicated, and the Trith-eism of those who resort to such attempts to evade their testimony, established in the present PART of this SECTION.

"The Baron's Creed," says this objector* "allows of a Trinity in the Godhead, and the following is the scheme of it: *Jesus Christ is God, and beside him there is no other; the Spirit within him is the Father; his body is the Son; and the operations and actions proceeding from both constitute the Holy Ghost.*" And he immediately calls this, without excepting any part of it, an "*anti-scriptural doctrine.*" Let this be looked at for a moment. Our doctrine, as here stated, affirms that "*Jesus Christ is God, and beside him there is no other.*" The objector declares, that this is an "*anti-scriptural doctrine.*" Consequently, this opponent believes, either, *that Jesus Christ is not God at all, or that there is another God beside him.* But we find he does not mean to deny Jesus Christ to be God at all: consequently, his belief is, that there is *another* God (if not two) *beside* Jesus Christ. I should not have pressed this conclusion from his words, had he not repeated the sentiment. I should have concluded that he had merely made a slip of the pen, in seeming to assert that there are other Gods beside Jesus Christ. But that such is really his opinion, whether he meant so openly

* Anti-Swedenborg, page 10.

to avow it or not, is evinced by the whole of his subsequent reasoning, as will presently appear.

"The Swedenborgians (he says)* support their doctrine of the Person of Christ being the entire Godhead on the following Scriptures chiefly : "*I and my Father are one.*" (John x. 30). "*He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.*" (John xiv. 9). "*For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.*" (Col. ii. 9.)"

Our doctrine is here incorrectly stated, and the proofs on which we rest it are injuriously contracted. Our doctrine does not affirm "*the Person of Christ to be the entire Godhead,*" but to be one of the three Constituent Elements of the Godhead ; and our Scripture proofs of our doctrine in general, are extremely numerous indeed, as is evident from the sample in PART I. of this SECTION. The above three, however, are too clear to be evaded ; and we shall presently see how impossible it is to explain them into an agreement with the doctrine, that "*there are other Gods beside Jesus Christ.*"

For guiding the decision, the objector lays down a canon which is a very just one ; but let the reader judge whether his conclusion from it, or ours, agrees with it best. He states the canon thus : "It is a rule of criticism among divines, that Scripture is a key to Scripture ; and that wherever one part of Scripture appears to contradict another, then the analogy of the whole Bible, and unbiased reason, must determine which of the seeming contradiction ought to give way." His inference is this : "Wherefore the Scriptures which make Jesus Christ the Son of God, and a distinct Person from God, the Father, being very numerous, and unequivocally expressed, must in all fair construction determine the above cited texts to bear a very different construction to that which Baron Swedenborg puts upon them."† I beg to repeat the rule, with an inference more in harmony with its premises. "It is a rule of criticism among divines, that Scripture is a key to Scripture ; and that wherever one part of Scripture appears to contradict another, the analogy of the whole Bible, and unbiased reason, must determine which of the contradictions ought to give way." *Wherefore, the Scriptures which declare the strict unity of God being very numerous, and unequivocally expressed, must in all fair construction determine those passages which speak of a distinction between the Father and the Son not to mean such a distinction as destroys the great doctrine of the Divine Unity, consequently, not a distinction of persons ; thus they must determine the above cited texts to mean what they plainly say, and to bear a very different construction from that which a Thritheist would put upon them.*

* P. 11.

† Ib.

I. To deduce such forced construction this writer says* respecting the text, '*I and my Father are one*;' "This text is made by the Baron to signify, that '*I and my Father are one person*;' whereas the very grammatical form of the words is against such a construction. For we find *I*, which is one person, and then *my father*, which is another person; and these are coupled together by the plural verb *are*; but upon the Swedenborgian scheme our Saviour ought to have said, "*I and my Father am one*.'" Very peculiar notions of grammar are here propounded. Every one knows that the soul is not the same thing as the body; nay, as, while we are in the body, we have no consciousness of anything that passes, properly speaking, in our soul, but only of what affects our body and the region of our mind which is in contiguity with the body, we are constantly apt to identify the body with ourselves, and to regard the soul as something distinct from ourselves; and though we know that the case is actually the reverse, we still speak according to the appearance, as it presents itself to our senses. Thus every one uses such phrases as these: "When I die;" — "My friend is dead;" — "It is appointed to all men once to die;" although he well knows that the soul, which is truly the man, never dies, but only the body. Suppose then any one, in this familiar sort of phraseology, were desirous of expressing the fact, that the soul and body, while in union, make but one person, would he say, according to the proposed system of grammar, "*I and my soul am one*." Would the proposer himself talk so ridiculously? Would he or any one think, that by saying, "*I and my soul are one*," he was affirming the monstrous absurdity, that his soul and body are two separate persons? Does then the use, according to the regular grammatical construction, of the plural verb *are*, afford, even a shadow of a pretence for contradicting the explicit assertion which the Lord here makes, and for affirming that when he says, "*I and my Father are One*," we are to understand him as saying, "*I and my Father are Two*?" Such a declaration, also could have given no offence to his hearers; whereas no sooner were the words, "*I and my Father are One*," out of his mouth, then, as we are informed in the next verse, "the Jews took up stones to stone him;" and affirmed† that they did this "for blasphemy; because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God." The Jews, certainly, had no idea of more Gods than one. When, therefore, they understood, by the Lord's affirming his oneness with the Father, that he affirmed himself to be God, they understood that he affirmed himself to be the one and only God. It will require, then, something more than a grammatical or ungrammatical quibble,

* Pp. 11 12.

† Verse 83.

to evince that, in this plain declaration of the Lord, explained by this conclusive comment of his hearers, we are to understand him as meaning, that himself and the Father are two. When the Jews said on hearing it, "Thou being a man, makest thyself God," they clearly testified, that he affirmed himself and the Father to be One Being, One Person, One God.

"Here (adds the objector*) it will be proper to state the *gloss* which the learned Divines give upon the words before us, and which, I think, cannot be much mended; 'I and my Father are *one in will*, one in purpose, one in design, one in love, grace, and good will to all mankind: and all our operations tend to *one* and the *same end*, truth, righteousness, and goodness.'" This construction, he affirms, is supported by that text in which Jesus Christ says, "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are;"† and he afterwards‡ argues in the same manner from the texts which speak of a union between the saints and God. I once read a celebrated Unitarian work, intended to explain away the force of the texts which assert the Lord's Divinity, for which, if a descriptive title had been sought, I thought it ought to have borne the following; The rhetorical figure called *Meiosis* or *Extenuation*, applied to the interpretation of Sacred Writ: or, The art of extracting from the mountain of Scripture Truth, the mouse of Unitarian Doctrine." Certain it is that we are here presented with a specimen of that art, and that it is from "learned divines" of that school that the present extenuator borrowed his "gloss." Let, then, a learned divine of the school which he more generally follows here give the answer. In Doddridge's note on the Lord's words, "I and my Father are One," is this remark: "How widely different that sense is in which Christians are said to be *one with God* (John xvii. 21), will sufficiently appear, by considering how *flagrantly absurd and blasphemous* it would be to draw that inference from their union with God which Christ does from his:" that inference is, that, in *power*, also, he is one with the Father; which the extenuating "gloss" keeps out of sight.

But in the view taken by the opponent of the union of the disciples with each other and with their Divine Head, he totally reverses the order of things. The Lord never speaks of himself and the Father being one *as* the disciples are one; but in the ardor of his divine love, he desires that his disciples may be one, *as* himself and the Father are one. The union of himself and the Father is the *prototype*, that of the disciples with

* P. 12.

† John xvii. 11.

‡ P. 19.

each other and with their Divine Head is the *copy*; and who will pretend that, in anything whatever, man can be more than a most distant and imperfect copy of God! If the union of Christians with each other and with the Lord, is of the same kind and degree as that of the Lord and his Father, because Jesus desires "that they may be one *as we are*," then also the righteousness of Christians is of the same kind and degree as that of their Heavenly Father, because he commands, "Be ye therefore perfect, *even as* your Father which is in Heaven is perfect.*" Upon such a mode of interpreting the language of Scripture, the perfection of a good Christian, according to this text, is as great as that of God; or to express the subject more according to our opponent's mode of reasoning, the perfection of God is no greater than that of a good Christian. He must either affirm this, or admit that John xvii. 11, and the similar texts do not prove the point for which he quotes them. If the highest perfection of which men can be the subjects, is only a faint image of the ineffable perfection of the Divine Nature; then the closest union of which men can be the subjects, is only a faint image of the union of the first two Essentials of the Divine Nature. Again, to argue, because the union among the Lord's true disciples is an image of the union between the Father and the Son, or the Divine and Divine-Human Natures in the Lord, that therefore the union between the Lord's true disciples is equally close with that between the Father and the Son, is just as conclusive, as to argue, because man was created in the image of God, that therefore he was created equal with God. Precisely the same difference as that between God, and man as an image of God, is that between the union of the Lord's disciples, and the union of the Father and the Son.

If, then, this argument proves so void of solidity, what its author adds to it will not help to strengthen it, but only to expose, still more unreservedly, the polytheism of his sentiments. "This subject," he ventures to say,† "may be further *illustrated* by a mercantile firm, which may consist of three, four, or more individuals. Of these it *may be said*, and often is *said*, that they are *all one*; because they are *one* in purse, *one* in gains, *one* in losses, *one* in their hopes and fears and *one* in all their mercantile interests. But they are not *one person*." No, assuredly. Neither are they *one man*. In offering, then this similitude as an illustration of the Trinity, our opponent confesses, that, in his idea, the Father, Son, and Spirit are not only not *one person*, but they are not *one God*. As having entered into a kind of partnership for man's salvation, "it *may be said*, and often is *said*, that they are *all one*;" but by those who un-

* Matt. v. 48.

† P. 18.

derstand the use of the figure "*Meiosis*," in the interpretation of Scripture, this is known to be mere empty words; in and among themselves, they are as much *three several Gods* (my pen revolts at the words), as the "three, four, or more individuals" of "a mercantile firm" *are three, four, or more several men*.

Behold, reader, the Tritheism of Tripersonalism fairly unmasked. But will this naked unsupported assertion, that there are several Gods, carry the weight of a feather against the assertion of Jesus which it pretends to *illustrate*, "I and my Father are One?" If by such *arguments* our blessed Lord is *stoned* out of his Sole Divinity, in the mind of a Tritheist, may not accusers continue to cast such stones at him forever, before they will destroy the belief of this great truth in the mind of one consistent disciple of the Scriptures and of Reason?

2. The next text to be diluted into insignificance is, "*He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.*" The extenuator, who is at other times, a great enemy of the Spiritual sense of the Scriptures, is now very anxious to get rid of their literal sense also. "If these words," says he,* "be taken according to the *letter*, then several plain texts of Scripture will be clearly falsified; as for instance: "and he," (the Lord) "said, Thou canst not see my face; for there shall no man see me and live." (Ex. xxxiii. 20). "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." (John i. 18). "And the Father himself, which hath sent me hath borne witness of me: ye have neither heard his voice at any time nor seen his shape. (John v. 37). "Not that any man hath seen the Father, save he which is of God: he hath seen the Father." (John vi. 46). From these passages," adds the writer, "it is manifest that the words in question are to be taken *in a figurative sense.*" Before we look at the *figurative sense* proposed, be it observed that the Lord's words to Philip, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," and the other texts, here quoted, instead of falsifying each other, are, according to our views of them mutually illustrative in an eminent degree. They are all "*plain texts of Scripture;*" and certainly, the words to Philip are quite as *plain* as any of the rest. Combined, then, into one proposition, what do they teach? Clearly, this: That Jehovah in his pure Divine Essence, as he existed before the incarnation, was inapprehensible either by the bodily, spiritual, or intellectual sight of human beings; but that, by his assumption of Humanity, in the Person of Jesus Christ he rendered himself apprehensible, for a time, and in a certain degree, to their bodily sight, and to their spiritual and

* Page 13, 14.

intellectual sight forever. This obvious mode of uniting in one harmonious sentiment the (as the opponent would have them) conflicting statements, is also in one of them, clearly pointed out. "No man hath seen God [the Divine Essence] at any time; the only begotten Son [the Divine Humanity] which is in the bosom of the Father [or in the closest union with the Inmost Divinity] he hath declared him;" where the word translated, "*hath declared him*," properly means "*hath brought him to view*;" by which we are expressly taught, that the invisible and inaccessible God was rendered visible and accessible in the Person of Jesus Christ. As the glorification of the Person of Jesus Christ advanced towards completion, the otherwise invisible God was more and more fully manifested therein; since, therefore, when the Lord addressed the words to Philip, but one stage more of the great work remained to be accomplished, well might he say to the yet ignorant disciple, in stronger terms than this opponent likes to bring forward, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet thou hast not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father: and how sayest thou then, show us the Father?"

Plain, however, as this is; and beautifully as it harmonizes with all the texts quoted as in opposition to it, the objector resolves the declaration into figure. The figure of speech employed by the Divine Speaker, is assumed to be that of *Hyperbole*, or *Exaggeration*; wherefore its explainer again has recourse to the opposite figure of *Meiosis* or *Extenuation*. He finds (Col. iii. 10, and 1 Cor. xi. 7), that man is called an "*image* of him that created him," or "of God." He finds also, (Col. i. 15, and Hebrews i. 3), that Jesus Christ is called the image of the invisible God," and "the brightness of his glory and the express image of his *person*," (which last phrase, however, according to the original, is, "the stamped impression," or "the moulded form of his *substance*"), and thence he concludes, that Jesus Christ is an *image of God, in the same manner and sense as man is an image of God*. Lexicographers, however, tell us most truly, that the Greek term usually rendered *image*, "not only signifies an *image*, or an *effigy of the form of a certain thing*, but *the very form, figure, and, as it were countenance of the thing*;"* and this must be its meaning when applied by Paul to the Person of Jesus Christ, otherwise it would not agree with the same Apostle's other declaration just cited, that he is the Brightness, or Effulgent Display of the glory of God and the Stamped Impression, or Moulded Form of his substance. Hence, also, the Apostle distinguishes so accurately in his use of the term *image*, when applied to our

* Schleusner.

Lord, and his use of it when applied to man ; for he calls Jesus Christ “the image of the *invisible God* ;” but he never calls man so ; and by the image of the invisible God he obviously means, the Divine Form, in and by which the otherwise Invisible God is manifested, and rendered visible to his creatures. It is then perfectly true, that Jesus declares, that he that hath seen him hath seen the Father, in the same sense as the Apostle calls him the “Image” or “Visible form of the Invisible God ;” but never will it be true, either that Jesus uses those words of himself, or the Apostle these words of him, in the same sense as man is called “an image of him that created him.”

The opponent would force this low meaning on the Lord’s words by an *illustration* that is really shocking. Jesus Christ has declared it to be the will of God* “that all men should honor the Son *even as they honor the Father* ;” but the extenuator declares that we may honor *all good men* even as we honor the Lord : for he says,† “Respecting those who inherit the power and live in the practice of real religion, it might be said without blasphemy, that they who have seen *such*, have seen *God* : that is in a low degree, they have seen God in his moral likeness !”

I really felt thunderstruck when I read this declaration. I could scarcely believe it possible that eagerness to shun the force of a plain text could drive any one to such a degrading parody on the Lord’s words. Is its proposer prepared to stand by his statement through all its consequences ! Philip, unquestionably, was a holy man ; will the parodist then contend that it is a matter of indifference whether we read the Lord’s answer to him, “He that hath seen *me* hath seen the Father ;” or “He that hath seen *thee* hath seen the Father,” — that the declaration would be as true in the one case as in the other ? Yet this is no more than he asserts again, when he asserts in the next sentence, that “this may be said of a [*i. e.* any] good man or good woman.” No good man or good woman, it is certain, ever before dreamed of arrogating such divine honor, or ever will hereafter ; the person who makes the assertion doubtless considers himself as belonging to the class of good men. If then he, as a good man, finds it not repulsive to his feelings to say, “He that hath seen *me* hath seen *God*,” he will never have any for his rival — but the Lord Jesus Christ ! — I am persuaded that he must himself be shocked at the consequences which flow out of his proposition.

But error is always inconsistent ; and the author of the above “gloss” proceeds with observations which nullify his whole

* John v. 23.

† P. 15.

argument. "Now," he adds,* "if this may be said of a good man or a good woman, how much more may it be said of Him who knew no sin, who did all things well, in whose mouth was no guile, who was in the bosom of the Father, who came from the Father, and was with the Father before the world was, and who was as a lamb without blemish and without spot!" How much more, indeed! In fact when the writer sees that there is this infinite difference of character between the Lord Jesus Christ and a mere man, how strange that he cannot allow the Divine Speaker's descriptions of his own character to indicate that impassable difference between himself and a mere man, and that to apply them to a mere man is as great an outrage, as to apply to a man any other incommunicable divine characteristic! Now, however, he seems disposed to paint the difference as it really is; for he proceeds to say further, "But more than all these, Jesus Christ *inherited* in himself the attributes of the Father; those attributes which are designated as *essential* and *incommunicable*, namely, Omnipotence, Omniscience, and Omnipresence;" and he goes on for some time, giving Scripture proof of these truths. We do not desire a more full concession. Jesus Christ inherited the Divine attributes that are "*incommunicable*;" Can this be admitted by a writer, who yet will not allow that he who sees Jesus Christ sees the Father, in any other manner, than as he who sees any good man sees God? After he has affirmed that the oneness of Jesus Christ with the Father differs not in kind from the union that exists between good men and God, does he not see the inconsistency into which he plunges, when he adds in the same breath, that Jesus Christ possesses the *incommunicable* divine attributes of Omnipotence, Omniscience, and Omnipresence? If the oneness that exists between Jesus Christ and the Father be only a figurative, and not a real oneness, that is a personal oneness, does its impugner not see that he is now affirming, as plainly as words can convey it, that there are two Omnipotent, Omniscient, and Omnipresent Beings? By his own confession these attributes are "*incommunicable*;" does he not see then that he hereby openly affirms that there are two, if not three separate Gods.

Yes, alas! he sees it too well. It is the very doctrine he means to convey; and he has only laid down these glorious acknowledgements of the truly divine character of the Lord Jesus Christ as introductory to it. For behold the consistency of his conclusion. "Now seeing that *so much* of the divine power, properties, and perfections, are evidently found in the Son of God, 'in whom are hid *all* the treasures of wisdom and knowl-

edge,' might he not with much propriety say, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father, without meaning or intending to be understood, that he and the Father *were one and the same Person?*"* Here then are *two* Beings, each possessing the same *incommunicable*, divine attributes; *two Almightyes, two Omnipresents, two Omniscients*; for when Jesus says, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," he does not mean, we are told, to account for his possessing the *incommunicable* divine attributes by affirming that he and the Father are one Person, like the soul and the body, whence all the attributes properly belonging to each are at the same time the property of the other according to the Lord's declaration, when he says, "Father, all thine are mine, and mine are thine;† but the meaning of the Divine Speaker, it is pretended, is, that he is just such *another* as the Father; that he that seeth him does not actually see the Father, though he says so, but sees *one just like him, a fellow-God*. This is tolerably plain: but the writer is determined to leave no doubt about *his* meaning, whatever ambiguity he may impute to the language of the Lord Jesus Christ; he therefore concludes his '*illustrations*' of divine language thus; "Do we not often even among ourselves, say, speaking of a father and his son, 'The son is the very picture of his father;' and sometimes we hear it also said, 'If you have seen the one you have seen the other.' But in these cases it is never apprehended that the two *like persons* are *one person!*" The note of admiration is the writer's own. He appears to think that he has now succeeded to admiration in proving, that the Divine Saviour was trifling with Philip's anxiety for knowledge on this most momentous of subjects, and was amusing him with paltry quibbles. When Jesus declared, and accompanied the declaration with every circumstance expressive of the utmost earnestness, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," he meant, we are to believe nothing of the kind; He intended, no more than we do, when speaking of two men, we say, "the son is the very picture of his father," especially if we add to it, "If you have seen the one you have seen the other." There is no more identity between the Lord and the Father than there is between a human father and son. As these, even when they happen to resemble each other most closely, are never one person, so neither are the Lord and the Father one person. As the human father and son, even though as often happens, they may be united in one "mercantile firm," are two absolutely separate men, so also the Divine Father and Son, though likewise united by a certain covenant, as by articles of partnership, are two absolutely separate Gods.

* Pp. 16, 17.

† John xvii. 10. ch. xvi. 14, 15.

Tripersonalists in general! do you acknowledge this writer's development of the mysteries of your creed? Many of you, probably, have never ventured to look so narrowly into it before. You have perhaps allowed it to remain wrapped in the swaddling cloths with which the perpetually repeated cry of "Mystery," has surrounded it; now that one of its nurses has drawn these aside a little, and exposed some of its features to view, how do you like their appearance? Which do you think is more reasonable, more consentaneous with the "analogy of the whole Bible" and "with unbiassed reason;" to believe that Jesus and the Father are two absolutely separate *Gods*, for, *suppress* the word as they may, you see your profound Tripersonalists, when they venture on *illustrations*, cannot help admitting *all that the word implies*; or to believe, without reserve or equivocation, that he that hath seen Jesus hath seen the Father, because, though not one and the same Divine Principle, they are together but one Divine Person, the one being the proper Form and Person of the other, the Visible God *in* whom is the Invisible, and *out* of whom nothing of either can be seen, known or apprehended? To this clear and most satisfactory apprehension of the subject, this view which combines into one harmonious whole every statement respecting the Divine Person and Nature contained in Holy Writ, the initiated, you see, have nothing to oppose but the entirely unsupported assertion, that the invisible, unapproachable God, is invisible and unapproachable still, and that the Visible God, that is, the God who became visible in the person of Jesus Christ, is quite a separate Being from the former, only bearing, in a figurative manner, his "moral likeness." The question then, is simply this: Which will you believe; the Tritheist, who calls on you to believe mere absurdity and contradiction; or the Lord Jesus Christ, who offers to your acceptance the most sublime, important, and satisfactory of truths?

3. Our explainer now proceeds to exercise his skill in the art of reducing mountains to mole-hills, upon the other text which he has selected for the operation: "*In him (Jesus Christ) dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.*" But when the reader finds him, in his first two paragraphs palpably catching at straws, and endeavoring to puff into repute the insignificant "meaning," (or rather no meaning) to which "some" ("learned divines," of course), and "others" have endeavored to reduce these weighty words; it must be seen that his only solicitude is, to divest them of all their proper meaning, and provided this can be accomplished, that he little cares what is substituted in its place. He begins* thus: "From these words

* P. 17.

some draw this meaning,—that as Moses taught the Israelites by ceremonial shadows of better things to come, his religion was unsubstantial, and, as to intrinsic value, empty: but Jesus Christ, the Great Teacher, being come; he taught nothing but substantial and necessary truths respecting God, &c. Therefore St. Paul is pleased to describe the superiority of Christ over Moses by the text before us: as if he should say, ‘in Christ’s dispensation there are no empty shadows, no unsubstantial ceremonies; but on the contrary there is a fullness of doctrine, example, revelation, spirit, wisdom, sacrifice, merit, love, and goodness. This construction of the text is not unworthy of consideration.’ So thinks the extenuator; dost thou, reader, think so too? The text, remember with the verse preceding, says: “Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy, and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ: for in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.” Is not the above comment an open attempt to substitute mere emptiness for fullness, and “to spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ?”

Conscious of this, its proposer tries again. “*Others,*” he states,* “say that St. Paul had reference to the divine appearance between the cherubim on the mercy-seat, that appearance being but in vision, seen but seldom, and then only by one person, the high priest. This manner of the divine appearance to men, they say, was *rare* and *scanty*; and to this, therefore, Christ is contrasted, because he derived from the Father a plenitude or *fullness* of the Divine attributes, the spirit without measure, and all moral perfections in an infinite degree,” &c. This is a little better; but do you find, reader, any reference in the Apostle’s words to the *rare* and *scanty* manner of the divine appearance in the mercy seat, to satisfy you that he only refers to a certain *fullness of the divine attributes* in the person of Jesus? Does any imputed fullness of divine attributes, communicated to Jesus as a separate person, at all come up to the idea conveyed by the declaration, that *all* the fullness, not of divine attributes merely, but of *the Godhead itself—the whole Divinity*—dwelt in him *bodily, in a personal form*? but the Apostle, it seems, like his Divine Master, was apt, when HE was in his theme, to run into the use of *Hyperbole* or *Exaggeration*; wherefore his meaning equally requires to be diluted into insignificance, by the application of *Meiosis* or *Extenuation*.

The opponent, affecting to consider that these truly futile expositions of the text evince the unsoundness of our apprehension of it, proceeds thus: “The futility of the Swedenborgian

* P. 18.

doctrine respecting the phrase, 'all the fulness of the Godhead bodily,' will be still more apparent when it is considered, that *nearly the same language* is used in reference to ordinary saints, as in these words: 'That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend, with all saints, what is the length, and breadth, and depth and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge; that ye might be *filled with all the fullness of God.*' Here, then, we find *nearly the same phrase* repeated respecting the saints, as that which is now the subject of our animadversions.* Instead of being only *nearly* the same phrase, had it been *quite* the same phrase, such an argument from it would have been sufficiently answered by our remarks above, on the words, "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect." It would be impossible to argue, in the one case, that God dwells in the saints *in the same manner* as the Divine Essence dwells in the person of Jesus Christ, without arguing, in the other, that the perfection of the saints *is the same as* the perfection of their Heavenly Father. But in reality the Apostle's wish, "that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith, that ye might be filled with all the fullness of God," does not bear a near, but only a remote resemblance to his declaration, that "in Christ dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." In the one case, the *God* whose fulness is spoken of, is *Christ*; and Christ is mentioned as dwelling in *the hearts* of the saints *by faith*; in the other case, *God* is not mentioned, but the *Godhead*—*the whole of Divinity*; and this is not spoken of as dwelling in *the heart* of Christ *by faith*: but *all the fullness thereof*—*the entire Godhead*, is declared to dwell in him *bodily*; which is equivalent to saying, that his Body or Person is the Body or Person of the whole Divine Nature. Here is a wide difference indeed! But still less are the passages parallel as they stand in the original: for, in that respecting the saints, nothing is there said of their being "filled *with* all the fullness of God;" but literally translated it is, "that ye might be filled *unto* all the fulness of God; plainly evincing the Apostle's meaning here to be the same as when he speaks, in the next chapter, of the saints as coming "unto a perfect man, *unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ.*"† To be filled *unto the fullness of God*, or to attain to the *measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ*, is, obviously, to reach that perfection in the spiritual life for which God or Christ designs us, to be replenished, according to the full measure of our finite capacities, with all heavenly graces, *to receive to the utmost, of his fullness, and grace for grace.*‡

* P. 18. 19.

† Verse 13.

‡ John i. 16.

How could we *receive of his fullness*, had it not “pleased the Father that in him should *all fullness dwell*?”* How then can the fullness of which we receive *from* him, be *all the fulness that is in him*? The fact that all our fullness is received from him, proves, not that there is no more or other fullness in him than is received by us, but that in him most truly dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, that he is the Personal Form of the whole Divine Nature; whence, of *his* fullness, we receive a portion.

The extenuator might have learned far better to understand this subject from his Concordance, than from the “learned divines” of the Unitarian school whom he has followed.

“Whereas,” says honest Cruden on the word *fullness*, “men are said to be filled with the Holy Ghost, as John the Baptist (Luke i. 15) and Stephen (Acts vi. 5); this differs from the fullness of Christ in three respects: 1. Grace and the Spirit be in others by participation; as the moon hath her light from the sun, rivers their waters from the fountain, and the eye its sight from the soul; but in Christ they be originally, naturally, and of himself. 2. In Christ they be infinite and above measure (John iii. 34); but in the saints by measure, according to the gifts of God (Eph. iv. 16). The moon is full of light, but the sun is more full; rivers are full of waters, but the sea is more full. 3. The saints cannot communicate their graces to others; whereas the gifts of the Spirit be in Christ, as a head or fountain, to impart them to others; ‘We have received of his fullness’ (John i. 16). It is said (Col. ii. 9), ‘That the fullness of the Godhead dwells in Christ bodily; that is, *the whole nature and attributes of God are in Christ, and that, really, essentially, or substantially; and also personally, by nearest union as the soul dwells in the body, so that the same person who is man is God also.*’ This is a just account of the matter. And as the Godhead, which thus dwells personally in Christ, as the soul in the body, is not a part of the Godhead merely, one of three persons, into which according to the fictions of men, the fullness of the Godhead is divided, but is, according to the express declaration, *all the fullness of the Godhead*; it follows that this declaration of Cruden’s is true in the fullest and most ample sense; and further, that as nothing but a truly Divine Body can be the abode of the whole of the Divine Essence, Jesus Christ is in proper one Person, as to Soul and Body, the One Only and Infinite God.

The objector here adds some passages in which God is said to dwell in men, to draw from them the inference, that as the dwelling of God in men does not make them one person with

* Col. i. 19.

God, no more is this the case when all the fullness of the Godhead is said to dwell bodily in Christ; but it is needless to say any more than has been said already, to prove, in his own language, that this argument is a "downright sophism." So far from any argument being thence to be drawn against the unity as to person of Jesus and the Father, such texts as these, in fact, strongly confirm it. For it has already appeared, that the God who dwells in the saints is Jesus Christ, by virtue of the spirit communicated from him, and that they have no intercourse with the inmost of Deity called the Father, except as this dwells in the Divine Humanity of Jesus Christ. Thus we find Jesus saying, in his address to the Father just before the completion of his glorification, "the glory which *thou* gavest me, *I* have given *them*; *I* in *them*, and *thou* in *me*;"* and many similar statements might be mentioned. Thus it is obvious, that it is from Jesus Christ alone that the saints immediately receive all that makes them such; and that Jesus Christ is able to impart it, because the whole Divine Essence, called the Father dwells bodily in him. Thus his dwelling in the saints is not of the same kind as the Father's dwelling in him, but is an image of it; for no one will pretend that the saints actually receive the whole fullness of Jesus Christ, so that he has no existence out of them, as is repeatedly affirmed respecting the dwelling in Jesus Christ of the Father. And as the fullness of the reception by saints of Jesus Christ is infinitely inferior to the fullness of his reception of the Father, it follows again, that their union with him is not of the same kind as his union with the Father, but is an image of it; just in the same manner as the perfection of the saints is not of the same kind, but is only an image of, the perfection of their Heavenly Father; and as man himself is not God but is only an image of God.

As our extenuator has succeeded so ill in destroying the meaning of these three conclusive texts of Scripture, he at last betakes himself to his best refuge, the plea of mystery, and employs, as noticed above,† the remaining four pages of his present Section in deprecating all inquiry, and extolling ignorance as a Christian privilege. Here, therefore it is quite needless to follow him. The same, doubtless, is true of error in regard to religious doctrine, as the Lord affirms of evil in heart and life. "Every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light lest his deeds should be reproved."‡ But it is somewhat curious, that, after his own disclosures, he should have penned the following sentence: "It were much to be wished that men, even good men, were more *cautious* and *reserved*, in their language respecting the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, than

* John xvii. 22, 23.

† P. 369.

‡ John iii. 20.

they commonly are.”* Of course, then, he intended to practice the *caution* and *reserve* which he so earnestly recommends. He is sensible that Tripersonalists have *much to conceal*. And yet we have seen that he has so far let out the interior sentiments of his mind or his creed upon the subject, as to evince that, in his ideas, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are three separate Gods; may we not conclude, then, that had he not aimed at being “*cautious and reserved*,” he would openly have used the very words?

Since then these three important texts stand quite uninjured by the efforts to deprive them of meaning, but, the more they are examined, are more demonstrably seen to be *plain* declarations of the most important doctrines; and since, as is obvious, in agreement with these texts only can be understood the other texts which speak of the Father and the Son, so as to be in harmony with those numerous passages which affirm the strict Unity of the Divine Being; it follows that we are to believe, what these three texts so plainly affirm, that the Lord Jesus Christ is one Person with the Father,—the whole Godhead dwelling personally in him, as the soul in the body. Abundant other proof of the same grand doctrine has been given above; and the only portion of the Scripture evidence that the writer I follow has ventured to attack, has now been shown to be invulnerable to all his objections. It is eternally true, as the Lord declares of himself, that *He and the Father are One*, and that *he that hath seen Him, hath seen the Father*; and as Paul declares of the same Glorious Being, that *in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead, bodily*. No attempt has ever been made to explain these texts to any but the New Church sense, which did not wear the character of most miserable subterfuge, most palpable violence. And how must our conviction of the truth they teach be strengthened, when we find, as has now indisputably appeared, that Tritheism lurks in the interior thought of those who deny it,—that when, in the warmth of argument, they forget their wonted caution and reserve, they allow the triple-headed monster openly to display his dreadful form,—that the only alternative for those, who asserting a Trinity, deny that it is centered in the Single Person of the Lord Jesus Christ, is to acknowledge in heart, if not commonly with the lips, three several Gods!

SECTION VII.

THE TRINITY, AS CENTERED IN THE PERSON OF THE LORD
JESUS CHRIST.

PART IV.

*The True Doctrine confirmed from the Texts most relied on for
the Proof of the contrary.*

WE have seen in the preceding PARTS of this SECTION, that the affirmative of the Grand New Church tenet, of the Sole Divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ, his Oneness with the Father, and the concentration of the whole of the Divine Trinity in his Single Person is easily proved; that an acquaintance with the truths relating to his assumption and glorification of the Humanity, takes away the ground of all the objections that can be raised against it, and proves its certainty by another process; and that these proofs, impregnable in themselves, still receive a great access of confirmation, when it is seen, that the only proper alternative of this genuine doctrine, is that of Tritheism, and that its opponents cannot resist it without betraying, that, when contending for three distinct Divine Persons, they mean, in the thoughts of their hearts three distinct Gods. Nevertheless, there unquestionably are passages, which to those who read them without understanding, may seem to favor that doctrine; it may tend, therefore, more fully to satisfy the minds of some, to pass the chief of such texts under review, to apply to them the principles for solving objections developed in PART II., and to show, as is the truth, that they in reality teach, not the separation as to Person between Jesus and the Father, but their union. As then the writer whom I chiefly follow, after making the objections considered in the preceding PART of this SECTION to some of the texts which prove the true Doctrine, has selected those which he regards as the strongest for supporting his erroneous views, I will, in the present PART, place those passages in their proper light, point out the inapplicability of his conclusions from them, and evince that, like every other text in the Bible, rightly understood, they illustrate the grand truth, that the whole Trinity is centered in the Single Divine Person of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The writer I follow undertakes to show, "that whilst Baron Swedenborg has removed the mystery of the Trinity, in his way, he has created above a hundred other mysteries by doing so." The way this is attempted to be shown, is, by "joking

and jesting" on the subject to such excess, that the joker deems it necessary seriously to assure his readers, "that whatever appearance of levity there may be in his remarks, they are not in any wise to be even suspected of being levelled at the Divine Being, or the Divine Character, but wholly and entirely against Baron Swedenborg and his system."*

As, however, we consider joking not very appropriate to such a subject, and to be but a poor substitute for argument, I shall not repeat or take notice of this witty gentleman's *facetiae*, after citing at length his "remarks" on his first Scripture quotation; as a specimen of the spirit in which not a few of our adversaries, both rigid Dissenters and clergymen of the Establishment,† have deemed themselves justified in indulging, when commenting upon the most sacred truths.

1. "When Jesus was baptized in the river Jordan, 'lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the spirit of God decending like a dove, and lighting upon him; and lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.'‡ Here," says the adversary,§ "we find the Son of God, the Spirit of God, and a voice from heaven; and yet, according to Baron Swedenborg, there is but one Person in all these. Now, reader, didst thou ever know a man that begat himself, and of course, was his own Father; and then proclaimed himself his own beloved Son; and then told the world that he was very well pleased with himself? Methinks thou wilt say, why this is perfect absurdity and downright nonsense. So I think; but it is Swedenborgian sense. Did not I tell thee, that the Baron, in getting rid of one mystery, in his way, had bred a hundred, each of which are far greater than the one he pretends to remove?"

The whole of this raillery proceeds upon the assumption, that Swedenborg admits no distinction whatever in the Divine Nature; whereas; as has been abundantly shown in PART II. of this SECTION, we regard the terms, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as denoting really distinct Principles in the Godhead, though not forming three several Persons. It has also been shown that we do not consider the person or Humanity of Jesus Christ to have been Divine, and thus to have been the proper Person of the Father, at his birth, but to have been in progress towards becoming so during the whole course of his life in the world, and not to have been completely so till his ascension. — Thus all the above "joking" about a man that begat himself, and was his own father, and proclaimed himself his own beloved Son, &c., is only applicable to what the author is pleased to put

* Anti-Swedenborg, p. 25.

† Such as the Rev. W. Ettrick.

‡ Matt. iii. 16, 17.

§ P. 26.

forth as our doctrine, but not, in the slightest degree, to our doctrine itself.

The arrival of a certain state in the Lord's progress towards union with the Essential Divinity is what is described in this text; and it is described by appropriate representative appearances and expressions, such as are always employed in Scripture for the expression of purely divine and spiritual subjects. By the Son is meant the Lord as to his humanity, including not only the outward body, but all the nature belonging to him as a man. By the Holy Spirit's descending as a dove, and lighting upon him, is meant the open communication between the Divine Essence and the Human, by the outpouring, from the former into the latter, of the Emanating Sphere of the Divine Life. A dove is the proper symbol of purification and regeneration, and of the marriage-union of goodness and truth: the work of regeneration in man is an image of that of glorification in the Lord, and the union of goodness and truth in man is an image of the union of Divinity and Humanity in him and as the whole of this transaction was representative of the accomplishment of an important stage of his glorification, or of the union of his Divinity with his Humanity, therefore the Holy Spirit communicated was represented by the appearance of a dove. By the voice from heaven, saying, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased," is described, the manifest perception now enjoyed by the Lord in his external part, by communication from his internal, that his Humanity, so far as glorified, was derived solely from his Divinity, and was its Form and Organ.

Now may I not appeal to every reader possessed of candor and rationality, and ask, whether this, instead of being ludicrous, is not a truly rational and consistent view of the subject? But can the same be said for the adversary's representation of it? According to him, we have here a manifest exhibition of the three Persons which he assigns to the Godhead. As this notion is taken from the literal sense of the passage, he must in maintaining it adhere to the literal sense only: he must not take, first, the doctrine from the letter, and instantly tell us that the letter does not give a true account of it. According to the letter, then, — of the three Persons of this gentleman's Trinity, only one has the human form: the form of the Holy Spirit is that of a dove, and the form of the Father is that of — a voice! Is it not evident that this mode of describing the three Divine Essentials is here adopted, to prevent us from supposing that they are three separate Persons? Were there any truth in such doctrine, here, certainly, was a fair opportunity of placing it beyond doubt? Why might it not have been said, "and God the Holy Ghost descended and hovered over him; and God the

Father looked down from heaven, and said, "this is my beloved son," &c. Can the Tri-personalist offer a shadow of a reason, why some such form of description as this was not employed! These are the ideas supposed to be intended: why then were they not expressed? Why, but because they are totally foreign to the truth?

Whenever the three Essentials of Deity are representatively exhibited, the same caution is observed, of not using any symbols which would give the idea of *three divine Persons*.—Thus, in the sublime vision in Rev. iv., the Lord, as a Divine Man, is seen sitting on the throne of heaven, and his holy spirit, or the Emanation of his Love and Wisdom, is represented by "seven lamps of fire burning before the throne," which are said to be "the seven Spirits of God." Will any one make a separate Person of this representation of the Holy Spirit? Whoever does so, must not merely make him one Person, but *seven*. In the next chapter, the divine writer has occasion to advert specifically to the Human Nature of the Lord: is this exhibited as another Divine Man? This would necessarily have conveyed the idea of two Divine Persons: to avoid which, therefore, an appearance of a Lamb is presented, having seven horns and seven eyes; and these *eyes* are now declared to be the same Divine Principle as was before represented by the seven *Lamps*, for they, also, are said to be the "seven *Spirits of God*." Will any one infer, from this representation, that the Lord Jesus Christ is actually a separate Divine Person from the Father? Whoever does so, must assert him to be in the form of a Lamb, and to have seven horns and seven eyes. And after all, the seeker for three Persons will quite lose the separate personality of the Holy Ghost; for this Divine Principle is now declared to be inseparable from the person of the Lamb,—to be his "*seven eyes*." Here then are plenty of mysteries for the Tri-personalist to solve, if he is resolved to go on, arguing from such passages as that which relates the descent of the Holy Spirit as a dove, in favor of his notion of a Trinity of Persons. But all becomes clear when we observe, that in no divine representation of the subject is there ever exhibited more than *one* Person which can possibly be regarded as *the proper Person of Deity*; and that the three great Essentials entering into the composition of this One Person, when considered distinctly, are symbolically represented by voices, or doves, or *lamps*, or lambs, or eyes.

That at the time when the appearance occurred at the Lord's baptism, though his external frame was yet unglorified, the interiors of his nature were actually Divine, is a fact which may be illustrated by an event which is recorded sometime afterwards, when the glorifying process had passed upon the whole of his Human Nature except the mere body. When he ex-

hibited himself to the three apostles at his transfiguration, though his outer frame was still composed of natural flesh and blood, "his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was as white as the light."* What was this, but his Divine Human Form, which was strictly one Person with his Divine Essence, and to which he referred when he said, "I and my Father are one?" the Divine Love in which gave to his face the appearance as of the sun, and the sphere of Divine Truth encompassing which was representatively exhibited by garments white as the light, according to the description of Jehovah by David, "Who coverest thyself with light, as with a garment."† This Exhibition of himself in his truly Divine Person, as this existed within, and in a sphere above, his yet unglorified outward frame, was made to the disciples by opening, for the time, the sight of their spirits, and closing that of their bodies; in which state they beheld the Lamb in his Divine Human Form, and no longer in the material human form with which the former was yet invested; hence also they saw at the same time Moses and Elias, who were purely spiritual beings the inhabitants of a purely spiritual world: and hence, when they returned into their natural state again, "they saw no man save Jesus only;" and him no longer in his Divine, but only in his natural, yet unglorified outer form. Here is demonstrative evidence of his possessing an internal and an external personal form, in the former of which he was a Divine Person complete, independently of the latter, whilst the latter was not a person at all, independently of the former, since without the former it would not even have possessed life. An attention to the important truth thus obviously presented, will illustrate many particulars connected with our Lord's glorification, and his oneness with the Father.

2. "If thou be the Son of God," said the devil, "cast thyself down; for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee;" &c.‡ This text is abundantly explained by our observations on the former. The Son is the Lord's Human Nature, not yet wholly glorified, and therefore liable, as to the *merely* human part of it, "to be tempted of the devil." *He* — God — is the Divine Essence, not yet wholly united to the Human Nature. The union was to be affected by expelling from the Human Nature all that partook of human infirmity, and by renewing it from the Divine Nature; and the means were, by suffering the Human Nature to be attacked by the infernal powers, and by its resisting their suggestions; by which, at the same time, hell was conquered and removed from man. Could the infernal powers have prevailed in any one conflict, the Human Nature could not have been united with the Divine, and the work of redemption would have failed of its accomplishment. This

* Matt. xviii. 2.

† Ps. civ. 2.

‡ Matt. iv. 6.

they knew ; and therefore they exerted all their force and artifice to carry their point. Thus, that which our opponents aim at preventing from being believed, the perfect union of the Divinity and the Humanity in the person of Jesus Christ, is precisely that which the devil aimed at preventing from being accomplished.

3. "And devils also came out of many, crying out, and saying, Thou art Christ, the Son of God,"* "They did not confound the two Persons of Father and Son in one Person," says the Tri-personalist, "as the Baron does." We have seen that, to acknowledge the Humanity and the Divinity to be two distinct *principles*, is quite a different thing from dividing the One God into Two, as Tri-personalists do.

4. "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men him will I also confess before my Father which is in heaven."† "Here again," says the objector‡ "is the Father and the Son ; and it is worthy of remark too, that the Father is in heaven, whilst the Son was speaking on earth. Now if the Father and the Son were both comprehended in the person of Christ, what could be more absurd than the language of Christ, when he says, 'him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven.' Why not speak of himself only, and tell his followers what good things he himself would do for them, without that continual reference to his Father, which he gloried in making?" Well : if the Tri-personalist believes the Father and Son to be two completely separate persons, so that, if the Father is in heaven, he cannot be united as one person with the Son upon earth, he at least believes the Son to be but one person ; and yet the very same phraseology which is here used of the Father and the Son, is used by Jesus of himself alone. "No man," saith he, "hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down *from* heaven, even the Son of man which *is in* heaven."§ It is here declared that the Son of man was *in* heaven, whilst he was speaking *on earth*. Will the Tri-personalist therefore say, "Now if the Son of man was comprehended in the person of Christ, what could be more absurd than the language of Christ, when he says while on earth, 'even the Son of man which is in heaven?'" If he will not repeat the scoff in the present case, let him acknowledge, that if, in divine language, one Divine Principle may be spoken of as being in heaven and on earth at the same time, with equal propriety may this be affirmed of two Divine Principles, without any actual separation being intended ; that if such phraseology proves the Father and Son to be two separate persons, it proves with equal certainty the Son alone to be two separate persons also. In Di-

* Luke iv. 41. † Matt. x. 32. ‡ Pp. 26, 27. § John iii. 13.

vine language, heaven and earth do not so much mean two specific places, as whatsoever is internal and external respectively : thus, when the Lord speaks of his Father which is in heaven, he means much the same as when he speaks of the Father that dwelleth in him. And when he says, "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father which is in heaven," he means, that whosoever acknowledges him in faith and life, shall have communication and conjunction, in and by his Divine Humanity, with the Divinity itself. Thus, instead of referring men to any God out of himself, he calls them to himself, as the only object of worship,—as the only Person in whom the Godhead can be approached.

But, to clear this subject further, let it be asked : Do our adversaries imagine, when Swedenborg speaks of the Divine Essence or God himself, as assuming Humanity in the Person of Jesus and as being the soul of that Humanity from its conception, that he means it to be understood that the Divine Essence, or the whole Deity, was shut up in the material frame taken from the Virgin Mary, like an etherial essence in a bottle, and that, so long as the Person of Jesus remained on earth, heaven was left without its Governor, and the whole Universe, except that little portion occupied by the material body of Jesus, was shut out from the presence of God ? Nothing can be more abhorrent from all the views of Swedenborg than such a phantasy. According to his expressive language, "God is in all space without space, and in all time without time ;" he is universally omnipresent through all space and all time, without partaking in the least either of the one or of the other. Hence, then, it was quite possible for "the Father" to be "in heaven," considered even as a place, and yet to be in intimate union with the person of Jesus on earth : and so far as that person entered into this union, that is, so far as it was made Divine, it, also, was not in space, though still retaining a close connection with the outward frame, which was all that appeared before men : and when the outward frame also had been made Divine, as was the case at the resurrection, and most entirely at the ascension, it, likewise put off the trammels of space ; and the Lord is now as completely omnipresent with respect to the whole of his Divine Person, as with respect to the Essence of Deity. "Lo, I," in the Divine Body in which you now behold me, says the ascending Saviour to his followers, "*am with you alway*, even to the end of the world.*

The objector's last interrogation, quoted above, as expressing the sentiments of many, also demands a remark. "Why not," says he of Jesus, "speak of himself only, and tell his followers what good things he himself would do for them, without that

* Matt. xxviii. 20.

continual reference to his Father which he gloried in making." This implied denial of the power of Jesus "himself," to do good things for his followers, really approaches to the cry which said "Let Christ the king of Israel descend now from the cross," — from the state of impotence, to which, as we think, our denial and opposition have reduced him, — "that we may see and believe." But *at this time*, to have spoken of "himself only," would have been to teach, not the union of his Humanity with his Divinity, but its separation from it; in which state it would have been powerless. While the Humanity was yet but partially glorified, it necessarily was in the acknowledgement that all its power was from the Divinity, and looked to the Divinity that its glorification might be completed: and Jesus *at this time* spoke accordingly, to teach us these truths. But does he never "tell his followers what good things he himself would do for them?" He does this, with only occasional references to his Father, even while on earth; even in this very declaration, rightly understood, he promises that *he* will give, to those who acknowledge him and his power to give it, the highest privilege that can be conferred on a created being, the knowledge of and conjunction with, the Inmost Divinity; a promise that would be absurd in the extreme if the Inmost Divinity and he were not one Person. To the same purport he says elsewhere, "No man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him."* But after his resurrection he constantly speaks of *himself alone* as doing good things for his followers; because, his union with the Father being now effected, there was no longer any reason for his ascribing the power to him; accordingly *he never once does so*: himself being now the proper Person of the Father. "In *my* name they shall cast out devils, they shall speak with new tongues, they shall take up serpents," &c.† "He breathed upon them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost."‡ "Behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you."§ "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life," &c. "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the hidden manna," &c. "I will give to every one of you according to your works." "To him will I give power over the nations," &c.|| Thus the Lord Jesus Christ goes on through this chapter and the next, and indeed through the whole book, presenting *himself alone* as the inspector of his people's actions, and as *alone* doing "good things" to them that overcome. What blasphemy would all this be, were he now, in any respect whatever, a separate Person from the Father! And how careful should his professed followers

* Matt. xi. 21.

† Mark xvi. 17, 18.

‡ John xx. 22.

§ Luke xxiv. 49.

|| Rev. ii. 7. 17, 23, 26.

be, how they mock at the “good things which he himself will do for them,” and “for whosoever shall confess him before men !”

5. “For I am not alone, but I and the Father that sent me. It is also written in your law, that the testimony of two men is true. I am one that bear witness of myself, and the Father that sent me beareth witness of me.”* Great stress is laid by the Tri-personalist, in common with all his brethren, upon this text ; but, *what the Lord is here in reality asserting, is, not his separation from the Father, but his oneness with him.* This we will endeavor fully to evince, *FIRST, From the literal sense of the text and context : SECONDLY, From the spiritual sense of the Mosaic law referred to : and THIRDLY, By showing, that, even in the language employed, the Divine Speaker is careful to avoid any expression that might sanction the notion, that the distinction between himself and the Father is a distinction of Persons.*

We are *FIRST* to show, *That the Lord is here asserting, not his separation from the Father, but his oneness with him, from the literal sense of the text and context.*

He had just before spoken of himself as the Divine Truth itself, by saying, “I am *the light* of the world.”† The Pharisees denied this, and treated him as an impostor, with the scoff, “Thou bearest record of thyself ; thy record is not true.”‡ Jesus replies, that though he bears record of himself, his record is true ; and then he argues, in the words quoted, that he is not, as they supposed him, a mere man, but a man of Divine Origin, or, as to his essential and interior nature, a Divine man, and in close union with the Essential Divinity, or the Father. “I am not *alone*,” not in a state of separation from the Father, — “but I and the Father that sent me.” The construction of this last clause is left imperfect, and contains no affirmation, the words necessary to complete it being left to be supplied in the mind of the reader, as is often the case in the ancient languages. What then is *understood*, to complete the sense in English ? Evidently the clause is to be filled up thus : “I and the Father that sent me are *together*,” — that is, are in *union*, that is, as he explains it more fully elsewhere, “I and the Father are *One*.” He explains it also with sufficient clearness in this same discourse, when he says, in nearly the same words, a few verses below, “He that sent me *is with me* : the Father hath not left me *alone*.”§ And he explains his meaning still more fully, and in still nearer connection with the words in question, when he says,|| “If ye had *known me*, ye [should — or rather, according to the present use

* John viii. 16, 17, 18.

† Ver. 12.

‡ Ver. 13.

§ Ver. 29.

|| Ver. 19.

of the auxiliary verbs, ye] would have *known my Father also*." If he were here teaching the duality, the separation between himself and the Father, how would this be illustrated by the assertion, that the knowledge of himself necessarily includes a knowledge of the Father? If they were two persons: like two separate human witnesses, how could a knowledge of one of them, and he, according to Tri-personal notions, far the inferior of the two, include a knowledge of the other? The thought is preposterous; and it demonstratively proves, that the Lord is not here teaching the duality, but the unity, as to person, of himself and the Father; and that the duality to which he does advert is of a far different kind. The declaration, "*If ye had known me, ye would have known my Father also*," is in fact an exact counterpart of the declaration to Philip, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet thou hast not *known me* Philip? He that hath *seen me* hath *seen the Father*:" accordingly, the references in the margin of the common Bible refer us to these words as the parallel passage to the other. Both explicitly say, that, *to know Jesus*, is to *know the Father*. The parallelism becomes quite complete, when the similarity of the questions to which the two answers are given is observed. Philip, as an honest seeker, had said, "Lord, *show us the Father*, and it sufficeth us." Jesus answered in the words just quoted. The Jews had asked in the way of cavil, "*Where is thy Father?*" Jesus answered, "Ye neither know me nor my Father: *if ye had known me, ye would have known my Father also*;" as much as to say, though he would not say it more explicitly to men who did not ask for information, "My Father is within me, and I am the Manifestation of his person; insomuch that *he that hath seen me hath seen the Father*." If the Lord's design was, to prove himself to be a different Person from the Father, this would have been an extraordinary answer indeed. Besides; the Jews, to whom he was speaking, wanted no proof of this: what he had to prove to them, was not his separation from the Father, but his unity with him. Thus the whole context evinces, that this was his object; but, as was always his practice when reasoning with gainsayers, he proceeded with caution. He did not at once shock their prejudices and exasperate their hatred, by proposing bluntly a great truth which he knew they would, in that form, instantly reject: but "with many parables spake he the word unto them, *as they were able to bear it*."*

The parable or similitude by which he here introduces to them the doctrine of his unity with the Father, is drawn from the two witnesses of the Mosaic law: and the point of similitude which he aims at pointing out between such two witnesses

* Mark iv. 23.

and himself and the Father, is, not their separation as to person, but *their unity as to testimony*. Thus he proposes the *unity as to testimony* of such two witnesses, as an apt image of the *unity as to person* of the first two Essentials of Deity; and argues, that because he is thus in union with the Father, the testimony is true which he bare in calling himself "the Light of the world," and in saying, "he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life."

But, SECONDLY: In order to perceive the whole force, beauty, and sublimity, of the comparison which the Lord here uses, drawn from the two witnesses of the Mosaic law, *we must refer to the spiritual and truly divine import of that regulation*, as it stands in the Mosaic law itself; whence we shall see, still more clearly *That the Lord is here asserting, not his separation from the Father, but his oneness with him.*

We read in Moses, "At the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses, shall he that is worthy be put to death; but at the mouth of one witness he shall not be put to death."* Does any one suppose that this was merely a regulation of Jewish municipal law, and no more? Doubtless, as the Jewish was a representative dispensation, all the Laws which were prescribed by God for the regulation of the civil conduct and fate of its members, are in fact the laws which are to regulate the spiritual conduct and fate of mankind under all dispensations: indeed, it is absurd to imagine that God himself would act as a lawgiver of any lower order. The law before us then, is that which determines the eternal state of man. Now it is impossible to suppose that the witnesses upon whose testimony man is finally judged, can be any persons without him. No one can imagine that "He that searcheth the reins and the hearts," and who "knoweth what is in man" incomparably more perfectly than it is known to the man himself, will, at the hour of judgment, call any human or even angelic witnesses to testify what they know of him. The only witnesses that he will examine, are those of the man's own heart and mind. Man will be tried as to his state in regard to goodness, to truth, and to life; or, what is the same, as to the state of his will, which is the seat of his evil or his good, of his understanding, which is the seat of his true or of his false persuasions, and of his actions, which are the developments outwardly of the former two. Such is the Divine Mercy, that, if no more than one of these depose against him, he is not condemned. Trial is first made, whether, by affording him means of instruction, the testimony of that one witness can be taken off; or whether, when all external restraints have been some time re-

* Deut. xvii. 6.

moved, he will raise up against himself the other witnesses also. Thus, for instance, if a man from ill instruction, has imbibed false principles of religious doctrine in his understanding, yet has not applied them to confirm himself in evil, but has lived in the affections and exercise of charity; the single testimony against him of an ill-informed understanding will not be regarded: on instruction, he will reject his errors, and accept such views of truth as are congenial to the state of his purified will, and thus will become a happy angel. So, if he has professed the pure doctrines of the church and imbibed them in his understanding, but yet has cherished evil lusts in his heart, the testimony against him, even of this evil will, does not sink him to hell, till what the will dictates the understanding justifies, by confirming such false sentiments as sanction and defend the lusts of the will; a state which is seldom fully made up in this life, though, in the other, when no reformation has commenced, it soon supervenes. — This is the cause, also, that all who die before they have attained the full exercise of their rational faculty, are saved. The will, in all is evil by birth: but till man confirms it in himself by thinking in favor of it, in the free exercise of his rational faculty, it is not appropriated to him: and hence, by means of divine instruction provided in the other life, all who have not had the capacity of thus confirming it are saved. In short; it is the union of the will and understanding into an indissoluble one, so that what the will loves the understanding thinks, and what the understanding thinks the will loves, that determines man's state, either for heaven or for hell: and when these two witnesses thus concur, the third, or the actual life, necessarily adds its suffrage.

Now when we thus see what are the spiritual witnesses to which the Lord refers, we find that the example, instead of countenancing the notion of a separation of persons between him and the Father, demonstrates their perfect union. We see that the two witnesses, themselves, are not two individual human persons, but the two leading principles and faculties which constitute man a man in one person: the plain inference, then, to be drawn from the Lord's use of the similitude, is, that as the will and understanding constitute man a man in one person, so do the distinctions called Father and Son, in the Lord, constitute him God in one Person. If it were absurd to argue, that the will and understanding in man are two persons, it is equally absurd, from this passage, to make two Persons of Jesus and the Father.

But the beauty and strictness of the analogy which the two witnesses in man bear to the Father and Son in the Lord, will still more strongly appear, when we consider what the Father

and Son in the Lord essentially are. I have generally, above, defined the Father to be the Divine Essence, and the Son the Divine Humanity, because this is strictly true, and is the definition under which our view of the subject can be most readily apprehended. But what is, essentially, the Divine Essence? and what is, essentially, the Divine Humanity? The first essential of Divinity, doubtless, is Love or Goodness, and the second is Wisdom or Truth. Love or Goodness is the moving spring of all the Divine operations: in Wisdom or Truth it invests itself, as the soul in its body; therein it finds the means for accomplishing its beneficent purposes; and thence it goes forth into act. Love or Goodness is obviously the life or soul of Wisdom or Truth, and Wisdom or Truth is obviously the Form or Investiture of Love or Goodness. Indubitably, then, the Essence of the Divine Essence, so to speak, is Love or Goodness; and the Essence of the Divine Humanity is Wisdom or Truth. Hence the Lord Jesus Christ is emphatically called the Word, which is the Divine Truth; and hence it is said that it was the Word which was made flesh or assumed Humanity. Essentially, then, the Father is the Divine Love or Goodness, and the Son is the Divine Wisdom or truth. — Now we behold, in all its exactness, the analogy between the two witnesses, — the will and the understanding, on which, as united for good or for evil, depends the eternal state of man, — and the Father and Son, the Divine Love and Divine Wisdom, — united in the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ. We see also, that the distinction between the two Divine Principles, called the Father and Son, is most real, and on no account to be confounded; but that, before we can establish this distinction to be that of two separate Persons, we must be prepared to prove that Love and Wisdom can never exist in union in one Divine Person or God, nor will and understanding in one human person or man.

But this will appear more conclusively still, — it will be still more indubitably evident, *That the Lord is here asserting, not his separation from the Father, but his Oneness with him*: when it is observed, as we are, IN THE THIRD PLACE, to show, *That even while thus speaking in parables to the carnal-minded Jews, he is yet careful to avoid any expression which might sanction the notion, that the distinction between himself and the Father is a distinction of persons.*

The only way in which, from the literal sense of this passage, a conclusion can be drawn in favor of the doctrine of two persons, is, by asserting that the Father and Son are either merely two men, or that they are absolutely two Gods; and if both these conclusions are most abhorrent from reason and Scrip-

ture, most certainly the doctrine of a duality of Persons is not here conveyed in any way whatever. If the Lord had meant to say, that himself and Father were two witnesses, as distinctly two persons, as, according to the literal sense, were the two witnesses of the law, his words must have had this form: "The testimony of two men is true: I am ONE that bare witness of myself, and the Father that sent me is ANOTHER that beareth witness of me:" and the Tri-personalist's argument goes upon the supposition that he had actually said so.* Suppose he had, what would be the result? Here are two adjectives, ONE and ANOTHER, which of themselves mean nothing, but by reference to some substantive with which they are understood to be connected. The only substantive to which they can grammatically be referred is MAN. "The testimony of two *men* is true." Does then the Lord mean to say, "I am ONE MAN that bear witness of myself, and the Father is ANOTHER MAN that beareth witness of me." No one will affirm this to be his meaning. Well, then: we must make allowance for difference of natures, and complete the construction by such a word as expresses that difference. "The testimony of two MEN is true." But we are now speaking, not of man, but of God. "I then am ONE GOD that bear witness of myself, and the Father is ANOTHER GOD that beareth witness of me." The parallelism is here exact: but will any allow that this is the meaning? The writer I follow, indeed, will not be shocked at it, because he has abundantly disclosed that such is his idea: still, even he will be sufficiently "cautious and reserved" not to adopt the words, "*one God*" and "*another God*." He will therefore say, that we must understand the Lord as speaking thus: "I am *one Divine Person* that bear witness of myself, and the Father is *another Divine Person* that beareth witness of me." We will not quarrel about a word, when we know exactly what idea is meant by it. But in this use of the phrases, ONE, and ANOTHER, DIVINE PERSON, they are exactly equivalent to the phrases, ONE, and ANOTHER GOD; and it is impossible to suppose a shadow of difference between the two terms. For the whole argument rests upon the assumption, that the difference between the Father and Son as witnesses, is the same as that between the two men as witnesses; but these are two human *persons*, only because they are two *men*; therefore, if the Father and Son are two Divine *Persons*, they are also two *Gods*.

But this conclusion is shocking and absurd: therefore, it must be totally foreign to the meaning of the Divine Speaker.

* Many paraphrases and free translations most unjustifiably make him say so: as Doddridge, Campbell, &c.

And as such an idea as that of distinction of Persons in the Godhead, or of a partition of Divinity between two or three separate Gods, is utterly foreign to the meaning of the Divine Speaker, therefore he cautiously abstains from the language requisite to give a shade of color to such a conclusion. We have seen that the conclusion supposes his language to be, "I am *one* that bear witness of myself, and the Father *is another* that beareth witness of me." The word "*one*" but not the words "*is another that*," are given in the English version : but, though the word "*one*" is thus introduced to make the construction in English more easy, *there is nothing answering to it in the original*. According to the nearest rendering, the passage would be, "I am a witnesser respecting myself, and the Father that sent me witnesseth respecting me ;" or, not to turn the participle into a substantive, "I do witness respecting myself, the Father that sent me witnesseth respecting me." Now if the intention was, to declare that the Son is one Divine Person or God, and the Father another, this construction is as defective in the original as in the translation. The words *eis* and *eteros* are as necessary to such a sense in Greek, as the words *one* and *another* in English. Any speaker whatever, intending to convey such a sense, would naturally and necessarily have used them. To what cause then must the so cautious omission of them, by the Divine Speaker, be assigned ? To what but this ; That, in the literal sense, the parallelism between two agreeing witnesses and the Divine Father and Son is not complete, but that the distinction between two agreeing men only exhibits a certain general, coarse, and exaggerated *image or representation*, of the distinction in the *Divine Nature* which the terms Father and Son are used to express ? The two witnesses are mentioned as images of the two Essentials of Deity, the Divine Essence and the Divine Humanity ; or of the Essentials of those Essentials, the Divine Love and the Divine Wisdom ; just upon the same principle as painters and sculptors form representative images of Faith, Hope, and Charity, and all the other virtues ; and to argue, because two men are taken as the representative images of the Divine Essence and the Divine Humanity, or of the Divine Love and Divine Wisdom, that therefore those Essentials of Deity are two separate persons, is just as convincing as to argue, because Faith, Hope, and Charity, and all other virtues, are representatively imaged by distinct personal forms, that therefore no two of them ever existed together in one human mind.

Thus then we find, in every way in which the passage can be viewed, — *from the literal sense of the text and context ; from the Spiritual sense of the Mosaic law referred to ; and from*

the very language employed, — that what the Lord is here in reality asserting, is, not his separation from the Father, but his ONENESS with him.

6. "Jesus saith unto them, If God were your Father, ye would love me; for I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself but he sent me."* "Here" says the writer I follow, "is language as explicit as it possibly can be: for we have *Father*, God and Jesus says, "I proceeded forth and *came from God*; neither came I of myself, but he sent me." Now, candid reader, what sort of sense would it be deemed if a man were to talk of proceeding *from himself*, and *sending himself* on an errand; and then, having accomplished the object of his mission, of going back again *to himself*? And yet if the *Father* and the *Son* are one and the *same person*, according to the Swedenborgian doctrine, this must be the case. Here then, is another mystery of Baron Swedenborg's making."†

Only read one verse further, Jesus there adds, "Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word." By his *speech*, the Lord obviously means his language and expression: and by his *word*, the doctrine or truth which was couched within that language or expression: and he thus most explicitly declares, that we are not to understand what he had before said in a carnal and superficial manner. Now how did the Jews understand his *speech* in this instance? Evidently just as Tri-Personalists understand it, — according to the most carnal and most superficial purport of the words, as if "*a man* were to talk of proceeding from another man, and of being *sent by another man* on an errand." Jesus, however, explicitly declares, that *thus* to understand his speech, is *not* to understand it; and that the reason why it is understood so grossly, is, because the mind is adverse to the *doctrine*, or *word*, which the *speech*, in its genuine sense involves. All the "mystery," then, here charged upon Swedenborg, is, as every where else, of our accuser's making, not his: and his explanation of it relieves the subject of all unintelligible mystery whatever, by unfolding the doctrine contained in the Lord's significant *speech*.

Understood of the evolution of the Divine Humanity from the Divine Essence, the "language" is indeed "as explicit as it can possibly be." They who argue from it that Jesus must be a different Person from the Father, understand the term "*sent*" when applied to a Divine Being, as meaning the same as when applied to a man, — as implying locomotion from place to place, and separation, by distance, from that which sends him. But applied to Divinity, this makes a mystery indeed:

* John viii. 42.

† Anti-Swedenborg, p. 28

it subjects him to the limitations of space, and supposes that he can never be present in distant places at the same time, and cannot be present in distant places at any time, but by traveling about as man does. They who thus apply this text, suppose this to have been the case with the Son of God born from eternity; for as to the Humanity born of the virgin, they, of course do not think that this, literally, was sent *from* God at all; they do not believe that this was *with* God before it appeared in the world. The Son of God from eternity, then, they conceive, was so sent from God himself, as to be entirely separated from him by an immense tract of space, which was left without the presence either of the one or the other; neither of them, consequently, is omnipresent. Such are not merely the "mysteries," but the absurdities, consequent upon understanding the Lord's language respecting himself and the Father as if it were the language of a man respecting himself and another man; absurdities against which the Lord repeatedly warns us, not only by saying that his literal *speech* is not his *word* or meaning, but by declaring that though *sent* from the Father, he was not *absent* from him. "I am not *alone*, but I and the Father that sent me." "He that *sent* me is *with* me." When, therefore, Jesus speaks of himself as *sent* of God, he means, that the Divine Humanity is a *derivation* and *evolution* from the Essential Divinity, filled by it, and in the closest connection with it; that it is a putting forth of the divine energies in a form suited for their effectual exertion in the sphere of human existence, but without any separation from their Divine Source; as the sun by its heat and light operates in the world, which it could not do if its rays were separated from the fountain. Hence the Lord couples the statement with that strong declaration, which is alone sufficient to show how the whole is to be understood. "I proceeded forth and came from God:" which words, given literally from the original would be, "I *out of* God proceeded forth, and came;" and how could that which was not created by God, but proceeded forth *out of* God, be a separate person from the God out of whom it came?

When the meaning of the Lord's *speech* is thus understood, we may see that there would be no impropriety in the phrase, (however oddly it might sound, owing to the gross idea we attach to the term '*sending*'), if we were to say, that God *sent himself* into the world by the Humanity of the Lord Jesus Christ. We have only to conceive of *the Holy Spirit and the Power of the Highest*, by which, we are told in Luke, the Divine conception was produced, as proceeding forth into the sphere of life in which are men in the world, and there embodying themselves in the person of Jesus Christ, generated by their energy and

born of the virgin. In this Humanity, we see God would be present with mankind in a more particular and personal manner than could otherwise be possible. Here, God, in the Person of Jesus Christ, is the same God as the Highest by whose Spirit and Power that person was produced: He sent forth, or evolved from himself, but without any separation from himself, that Spirit and power, and, consequently, that Person in which they embodied themselves, so far as this Person is considered separately from the infirmities which at first adhered to it from the virgin mother: consequently, as God was in that Person which he thus sent into the world, he, in it, sent himself into the world, though without ever leaving for a moment his proper and peculiar residence in the highest or inmost of heaven and of the universe. Although then it would be nonsense "if a man were to talk of proceeding from himself, and sending himself on an errand;" the case is quite different when the like phrases are used of God, and when the terms are understood in the sense which they bear in divine language, and in which alone they can be predicated of the *Omnipresent*.

There is another passage somewhat similar to this, which the objector, in his observations, confounds with it; on which, therefore, we will make a few remarks. It is that in which Jesus says, "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world, and go to the Father."* In these words the Lord briefly describes the whole process of the assumption and glorification of the Humanity. What is signified by, "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world," has been explained already. He speaks of himself here, not only in regard to the outward human form, and to the perceptions which this had as a man in the world, but in regard to the Spirit and Power of the Highest by which that form was produced, and which ever animated it, in union with the Highest, the Father, as its divine soul. So long as this remained connected with any of the substances, perceptions, or material nature, inherited from the mother, the Lord was in the world, and, though there was a connection between the Humanity, through all the principles and faculties belonging to it, and the Divinity, the union between them was not complete. When, however, the whole of the forms and substances taken from the mother were put off, and Divinity was put on through the whole of the Humanity, the whole being renewed, or formed anew, from the Divinity; which Divine operation was on the eve of its full accomplishment when the Lord uttered these words; he personally appeared on earth no longer. The whole Human Nature, even to the extremes, which are called flesh and bones,† being

* John xvi. 28.

† Luke, xxvi. 39.

new Divine, the union between the Divine Humanity and the Essential Divinity became closer than can be conceived : all appearance, even of separation between them was abolished for ever : and this is what the Lord speaks of, when he says, "again, I leave the world, and go to the Father." Thus, whatever appearance of separation existed between the Lord and the Father while in the world, it only continued while he was in the world ; and whatever language he uses in reference to such appearance of separation, only relates to his state at that time. If then there are any who cannot conceive how "the Father and the Son were one and the same person" *while Jesus was in the world*, none, surely, will pretend that it is at all difficult to conceive this *since the departure of Jesus out of the world* : let them, then, cease to perplex themselves, by applying to our Lord in the latter state, *the texts which only relate to him in the former*.

7. "And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit : and having thus said, he gave up the ghost."* If both Father and son were found in the person of Jesus Christ, this is pronounced to be another mystery ! There is here, however, not even the appearance of a mystery, if it be borne in mind, what has been so fully shown in PART II. of this SECTION, and in Nos. 4 and 6 of this PART, that, so long as the Lord remained in the world, there was a portion of his constitution which was not Divine, and thus which was not properly one with the Father. The passion of the cross was the last temptation, by which the glorification or deification of the Human Nature was effected ; and, while undergoing it, our Lord was in the last extreme of his state of humiliation. As dreadful tortures were now inflicted on his outer frame, and the cruel scoffs of his persecutors entered his outer ears, at the same time that all hell united for a last assault upon the perceptions of his mind, the seat of those perceptions was drawn down, more than at any other time, into the very body. Hence the despairing exclamation recorded by Matthew and Mark. When, however, he says, "Father, into thy hands I [commend — more literally, I] commit my spirit," we see that he inwardly had a perception of his approaching complete union with the Divine Essence, and an assurance that, notwithstanding his present sufferings in the dregs of mortality that were yet adjoined to him, the divine *power*, of which the *hands* of God are mentioned as the symbol, would secure this result.

8. "And about the ninth hour, Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani ? that is to say, My God,

* Luke, xxiii. 46.

my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"* Here, it is argued, "there is one praying, and another to whom the prayer is most solemnly offered up:" if not, "Jesus Christ ought to have said 'Myself, myself, why hast thou forsaken me?'" The inapplicability of this parody of Scripture, will have amply appeared from PART II. of this SECTION, where are explained the circumstances of our Lord's state of humiliation, in which the seat of his perceptions was chiefly in the unglorified part of his human nature as taken from the mother, and in which his temptations and sufferings at times shut out from that part of his constitution the manifest sense of his connection with the Divine Essence. To argue then from what in these states he said or rather, from what the unglorified part of his nature said, against his Oneness, as to his Divine Humanity, with the Father, is just as conclusive, as to argue thence, that he really *was* forsaken by his Father. If he was not really forsaken by the Father, though to his perceptions, in this state, it appeared so; neither does it thence follow, that he was altogether a separate person from the Father, though to the part of him which suffered, such, at the time, was the appearance.

But I am surprised that a Tri-personalist should allege the despair of Jesus on the cross as a difficulty against us, when, upon his own views, he must either explain the seeming difficulty just as we do, or must substitute for it another difficulty far more serious and insurmountable. Tri-personalists believe, exactly as we do, that, in Jesus Christ, God was united with man, so as to form together but one Person; the only difference being, that we believe, since there is but one God, and that that one God was united with manhood in the Person of Jesus Christ; whereas they believe that it was a second God, co-equal with the first, that was thus united. Let us see then whether this division of the one God into two will help them to any other or better solution of the imputed difficulty, than that which we derive from our conviction that God is but one.

Tri-personalists believe that the Son of God born from eternity was at this moment in personal union with the Humanity born of the virgin: do they then think that the Son of God from eternity concurred in uttering this complaint? Was this despairing cry dictated by the Divine Nature, which, as a separate Divine Person, they believe was united to the Human Nature, or by the Human Nature alone? If their creed would permit them, I am sure they would gladly answer, that it was the Human Nature alone which suffered and died, and the perceptions and feelings of which alone were expressed in the exclamation, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me."

* Matt. xxvii. 46.

It is thus that the Tri-personal creed usually explains the passages in which inferiority or imperfection is ascribed to the Son: its advocates assure us, that such statements relate to his Human Nature only, to which they impute, upon occasion, a completely distinct consciousness. Thus when the Lord says, "Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father;" they tell us, that the Son is here only mentioned in reference to the Lord's Human Nature, which they thus represent to be positively ignorant of things which his Divine Nature knows. Ought they not then to view the present subject in the same light, and to allow our explanation to be completely satisfactory, when we say, that the *unglorified part* of the Lord's Human Nature (a distinction of which they are ignorant) at times had perceptions of its own, quite distinct from those which belonged to his Divine Nature also; and that they alone spoke in the dying exclamation?

But I apprehend, that for the sake of exalting the merit of our Lord's sufferings, the Tri-personalists' creed will compel them to forego this alone consistent and satisfactory explanation. They will then allege, that owing to the union of a Divine Person with a human form, the perceptions of the mere man were communicated to the God, so that the Divine Person knew no other than that it felt all that the Human Nature felt, and suffered and died with it; whence it follows, that it was as much the Divine Person as the Human Nature which exclaimed, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me," those words being addressed to another Divine Person. But can any possibly think, that this explanation has any advantage above ours? Must not every one see that it is encumbered with "mysteries," and completely inexplicable ones, from which ours is free? Our creed considers the perceptions of the Divine and of the unglorified Human Natures, in the compound Person of Jesus Christ while in the world, to be quite distinct, and to be distinctly expressed, so that it was the mere unglorified Human Nature alone which suffered, despaired and died; but the Tri-personal creed considers the perceptions of the Divine and merely Human Natures in the compound Person of Jesus Christ to be undistinguishably blended, so that a Divine Person as well as a human actually suffered, despaired, and, to his own perceptions, died. The creed of the writer I follow, as we have seen above, represents the Divine Person of Jesus Christ as possessing in himself "those attributes which are designated as essential and incommunicable, namely, omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence:" yet it considers that his own omnipotence and omniscience were now so extinguished by the weakness and

ignorance of his human nature, that he both felt unable to deliver himself, and despaired of being delivered by the other Divine Person his Father.

Look at these positive "mysteries," candid reader, and judge whether they are preferable to the satisfactory solution of all seeming mysteries which our doctrines present. Either the Divine and Human Natures, which both doctrines regard as combined in the person of Jesus Christ, had distinct perceptions or they had not: If they had, and the Tri-personal doctrine admits it in this instance as in others, then, according to both doctrines, it was the Human Nature alone which exclaimed, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" and their view of this subject is precisely the same as they objected to in us: If their doctrine affirms that they had not, or not in this instance, then it maintains the far more difficult supposition, of a suffering, despairing, and dying God. Thus they must either explain the seeming difficulty, just as we do, or must substitute for it a real difficulty, which is truly insurmountable. The writer I follow, with many more, falsely charges Swedenborg* with reviving the doctrine of Sabellius and the other ancient *Patripassians*. The charge, even if it were true as it is false, would come with an ill grace from modern Tri-personalists, who are *Deopassians* in the strictest sense of the word.†

It may also be worth remarking, that, in the dying exclamation, Jesus does not address the Divine Essence by the term *Father*, but by that of *God*. Thus, even upon the doctrine of more Divine Persons or Gods than one, it would be reasonable to conclude, that this was an address of the mere Human Nature to the Divine Nature or Person hypostatically united with it, rather than that it was an address of the Divine and Human Nature of Jesus unitedly to another Divine Person.

That the Lord, while in the world, had distinct perceptions in the distinct parts of his constitution, may be inferred from the very different language which he uttered at his crucifixion and death, as recorded by Matthew and Mark, compared with Luke and John; whose very different statements can scarcely be reconciled upon any other supposition, than that they express the perceptions of Jesus in the distinct regions of his human mind. Thus, while Matthew and Mark relate only the sense of separation from the Divine Essence experienced by the lowest unglorified part of his Human Nature, Luke gives only the confidence of approaching complete union with the Divine Essence with

* P. 10.

† For a complete refutation of the charge against the New Church of Sabellianism, and for proof that the common doctrine is *Deopassian*, see the *Appendix* to this work, No. II.

which the interior part of his Human Nature looked to the pure Divinity ; whilst John neither notices the sense of separation perceived by the ultimates of his Human Nature, nor the confidence of approaching entire union felt by the interiors of that Nature, but only the consciousness of union already begun enjoyed in its inmost part. Thus whilst in Matthew and Mark Jesus expostulates with his God, and in Luke relies on his Father, in John he makes no address to, nor even mentions, his God, or Father, at all, but speaks entirely of and from himself.*

That then in Jesus which suffered, despaired, and died, was the *merely* human nature only, — the mere Son of Mary, and not the Son of God. This was not a separate *person* from the Father, since what any human being takes from his mother, considered separately from what he takes from his father, does not constitute a separate person, but only a part of his person : yet it was not strictly *one with* the Father, much less was it, as the cavils of our opponents suppose us to affirm, *the same as* the Father ; for it was merely human, and not yet divine. It, however, was rendered Divine by means of this last temptation and passion of the cross, being entirely renewed, in consequence from the Divinity within. Thus, after the resurrection, the whole of the Humanity or Son was *one with* the Divinity or Father ; but it never became *the same as* the Father : as man's body is one with his soul, forming with it one man in one person, though it is not the same, but quite a distinct part of his constitution. This view of the subject clears from all difficulty the Lord's dying exclamation, and all the other circumstances relating to his state of humiliation, as completely as the Newtonian theory of the universe clears from all difficulty the phenomena of the motion of the heavenly bodies : to treat therefore such a view with derision, is to imitate the rustic, who believes, from the appearance to his senses, that the sun and stars move round the earth, and ridicules the philosopher who would convince him of the fallacy.

9. "Who [Christ] being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high."† The writer I follow asks, "how a man must proceed in order to *sit down on his own right hand* ? The Saviour (he adds) *sits down on the right hand of the majesty on high* ; and yet, according to the Baron's doctrine, *there is no right hand on the supreme throne in heaven besides his own*. Here is another mystery of the Swe-

* On this remarkable circumstance, see *the Plenary Inspiration*, &c., p. 588—599.

† Heb. i. 3.

denborgian manufacture.”* Here, again is an open display of Tritheism. We shall soon see who is here the manufacturer of mysteries. It is assumed, we see, that the right hand here mentioned is *literally a right hand*. On this assumption his whole argument proceeds: and then he distinctly presents to our imagination, *a Divine Personal Being sitting on the throne of heaven, with another Divine Personal Being sitting near his right hand*. Did ever the Polytheism of Tri-personalism more openly take off the mask? Was ever the belief in two or more Gods more distinctly avowed? The avower proceeds: “It is true the Baron was aware of the text before us, and has given an explanation of it such as it is: but they who can be pleased with it are not ill to please; for it appears to me to be void of all solid argument, and frivolous.” Was the writer aware, that among those who have been pleased with the “frivolous” explanation adopted by Swedenborg, are some of the most eminent authorities of the Anglican Church? If it is to be condemned as “void of all solid argument” when stated by Swedenborg, let us see whether any more solidity will be allowed it when it comes in the name of Bishop Pearson. “First,” says that learned writer, in the proper article of his *Exposition of the Creed*, “we must consider what is *the right hand of God* in the language of the Scriptures: Secondly, what it is to *sit down* at that right hand. God is pleased to descend to our capacity, and not only to speak by the mouths of men, but also, after the manner of men, he expresses that which is in him *by some analogy with that which belongs to us*. The hands of man are those organical parts which are most active, and executive of our power; by those the strength of our body is expressed, and most of our natural and artificial actions are performed by them. From whence the *power of God*, and the *exertion and execution of that power*, is signified by the *hand of God*. Moreover, since, by a general custom of the world, the right hand is more used than the left, and by that general use acquireth a greater firmitude and strength, therefore the *right hand of God* signifieth the *exceeding great and infinite power of God*.” The Bishop gives two other significations of the right hand of God; according to one of which it also implies “the glorious majesty of God,” and according to the other “celestial happiness and perfect felicity.” He then proceeds: “Now as to the first acceptance of the right hand of God, Christ is said to sit down at the right of the Father, in regard of that absolute power and dominion which he hath obtained in heaven; whence it is expressly said, ‘Hereafter, ye shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power’ (Matt. xxvi. 64, Mark xiv. 62,

Luke xxii. 69).” As to the phrase *to sit* : this, he says, “ pre-scinding from the corporal posture of session, may signify no more than *habitation, possession, permanence, and continuance* ; as the same word in the Hebrew and Greek languages often signifies.” They who will not receive Swedenborg’s explanation supported by such authority, must be “ ill to please” indeed : but when it is accepted, what becomes of the heathenish idea, of a side-by-side partnership in the heavenly throne ?

The above are all the texts which the writer I here follow, has quoted, to establish the notion of the separation as to Person between Jesus and the Father : I trust it has now sufficiently appeared, that they more truly establish their Unity, and confirm the grand truth, that the whole Trinity is centered in the single Person of the Lord Jesus Christ. — To add, however, to their force, for *his* purpose, their selector makes this observation :* “ There are more than a hundred texts in the New Testament, a great part of which are in St. John’s gospel, all bearing much the same meaning with those noticed above.” This is very true : there are a great many texts bearing much the same meaning as the above, and thus contributing to illustrate and confirm the New Jerusalem doctrine respecting the Divine and Human Natures in the person of Jesus Christ, and the progressive glorification, or deification, of the latter. It is the New Jerusalem doctrine alone which can explain such texts in agreement with “ the analogy of the whole Bible and unbiassed reason.” Our Tri-personalist gives a page of references to all the passages he could find which contain the words “ Father,” “ Son,” “ Son of God,” or “ Son of man.” But to what purpose are such references ? Who requires to be convinced that the New Testament contains those terms ? The question is, not about the existence of those terms, but the sense of them ; and it has now, I apprehend, been sufficiently seen, that they are not the titles of separate Divine Persons or Gods, but of the Divine and Human Natures united in One Person, which is that of the Lord Jesus Christ ; that this union, while he was in the world, was in progress only towards completion, whence the occasional appearances of separation between them ; but that, at his resurrection and ascension, the union was perfected ; whence, the Human Nature being thenceforth also Divine, and with the Divine Essence an Indivisible One, he ever liveth and reigneth the Supreme and Only Deity, — “ God over all, blessed for evermore.”†

Here, then, I will conclude this Section. It is certain, that the one God has from the beginning of creation, manifested himself to his people under various characters, expressed by

* P. 30.

† Rom. ix. 5.

various names, suited to their various states of necessity. Thus we find God saying to Moses, "I am Jehovah; and I appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, by the name of God Almighty; but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them."* Whether this name was altogether before unknown, is disputed among commentators: but it evidently was either first assumed, or was assumed anew, at the founding of the Israelitish Church by the calling of Moses: was it not then to be expected, that, when God founded the Christian Church, the character of which, compared with all that preceded it, was so entirely new, he would again manifest himself by an entirely new name? Now we may be certain that he never called himself by a new name, but in reference to some new manifestation of his character: was it not then to be concluded, that when he should appear in the character of Redeemer, it would be with some new development of the infinite perfections which are comprised in his essence; yet that it could not be as a separate Divine Person; just as, when he manifested himself as Jehovah to Moses, it was under a new character, but without any difference as to person from that in which he was known as God Almighty? Accordingly, we have abundantly seen, that both prophets and evangelists unite in proclaiming that such is the fact. Isaiah, we have ascertained, declares, over and over again, that the Being who redeems the church and human race is Jehovah; and not only so, but that Jehovah the Redeemer is he that formed the human race, that maketh all things, that stretcheth forth the heavens *alone*, that spreadeth abroad the earth *by himself*. Jesus is constantly called the *Saviour* in the New Testament: nay, the very name, *Jesus*, means the *Saviour*; but Jehovah, we have found, declares that beside himself there is *no Saviour*; the very name, *Jesus*, the *Saviour*, involves then a blasphemy, unless the being who owns it is the alone Jehovah. How clearly, too, is this established by the declarations of Jesus himself! We have noticed, in particular, his avowal to Philip, and have seen, that "every attempt to explain it to any but the New Church sense, wears the character of most miserable subterfuge, most palpable violence." Thus, while the Old Testament openly declares, that there is no Saviour beside Jehovah, and no Creator but Jehovah the Redeemer, the Redeemer of the New Testament corroborates the testimony with his solemn assurance, that there is *no Father*, that is, no Jehovah, *out of him*. If he that hath seen him hath seen the Father, it can only be, because HE IS HIMSELF THE PERSON OF THE FATHER, who dwells in him as the soul dwells in the body. Hence he is the proper Object of worship. As, when we address a man's body, we

* Ex. vi. 2, 3.

address his soul at the same time ; and in fact, if he is a sincere man, we see his soul in his body, because it shines through it, and causes it to express all its sentiments ; so, when we address the Lord Jesus Christ, we at the same time address the Father ; and, in fact, we see the Father in him ; because his Person is “ the brightness of the Father’s glory, and *the stamped impression of his substance*”* (as the original of that passage expresses it, — not *person*, according to the sense now attached to that term, because the Father, since the coming of Jesus Christ, has no personal Form distinct from his).

Altogether, then, I trust, the Candid and Reflecting will admit, that these first truths of theology are most certain, and assailable by no valid objection : that as there is, and can be, but One God, so the Lord Jesus Christ is He : that in his Glorified Person the whole Trinity centres ; the Divine Essence, or Father, being his Divine Soul, the Divine Manifestation, or Son, being his Divine Form, and the Divine Influencing Power, or Holy Spirit, being his Divine Effluent Life and Operation : thus that the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ is the proper Person of the Father, and is the Sole Dispenser of the gifts of salvation.

* Heb. i. 3.

SECTION VIII.

THE ATONEMENT, SACRIFICE AND MEDIATION OF JESUS CHRIST.

PART I.

Atonement in General, and Atonement by Sacrifices, especially by the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ.

I AM now to address to the Candid and Reflecting some remarks on the Atonement, Sacrifice, and Mediation, of the Lord Jesus Christ. These are subjects on which tomes innumerable have been written; and, certainly, to present our views respecting them with such fullness, as the labors which have been bestowed on building up and fortifying the commonly received sentiments might seem to demand, would require at least a whole volume of moderate dimensions. As, however, I have determined, in this work, to treat at greatest length those subjects in regard to which our views are generally thought most strange, which are those relating to the eternal world and state, and to the claims of the enlightened Swedenborg to attention as a particular Instrument for making known the truths to be discovered at the Lord's second coming; I shall treat this, like the other principal doctrinal sentiments which I am called here to discuss, with comparative brevity. I shall simply propose and explain what we believe to be the truth; I shall offer the system which, in our estimation, explains all the phenomena of the case in its principal branches; and shall leave the reader, for himself, to apply it to the detection of the fallacies, which compose, or support, the more prevailing doctrines.

"All things," says a great authority, "are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath committed

unto us the ministry of reconciliation ; To wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.”*

The Apostle here delivers, in one single sentence, the whole doctrine of the Atonement ; and, to call attention to it, he propounds it in the most express and formal manner. “ *God hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ :*” and the ministry of this reconciliation, committed to the Apostles, was, to declare this truth ; “ to wit, that *God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself*, not imputing their trespasses unto them.” The word here translated *reconciliation*, is the same as is elsewhere rendered *atonement* ; it cannot then be denied, that the Atonement of Scripture is nothing else but our reconciliation with God, effected by the dwelling of God in the person of Jesus Christ.

The word translated *reconciliation* being the same as is elsewhere translated *atonement*, the above text might, therefore, with equal propriety, be rendered thus : “ All things are of God, who hath *atoned* us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath committed unto us the word of *atonement* ; to wit, that God was in Christ, *atoning* the world unto himself,” &c. Had it been given thus, the ground of some prevailing mistakes would have been taken away. At present, the word *atonement* occurs only once in the New Testament. That is in Rom. v. 11, where the apostle says, “ And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the *atonement*.” It is not a little extraordinary, that a word which occurs but once in the whole of the New Testament, from which, more especially, Christians profess to derive their creed, should have come to occupy so great a space in the language of the theology of the day. And it is more extraordinary still, that it should have come to be supposed, that the Lord made an atonement *to the Father*, thus that the atonement was *received by the Father*, when yet it is said, *in the only text of the New Testament where the word occurs*, that it is *we who have received the atonement*. The reason of the mistake is, because the proper meaning of the word has been little attended to ; which is, as just stated, *reconciliation*. This was the only meaning which the word bore when the Scriptures were translated ; although, like the words *person*, *ghost*, and others, it has since assumed a different signification ; and men have been too much influenced, in their religious sentiments, by the changes which have gradually taken place in the meaning of words. In every other place, the same word, and its corresponding verb, are translated *reconciliation*, and *to reconcile*. Thus in the verses preceding

* 2 Cor. v. 18, 19.

that just quoted from the Romans, our translators say, "For if when we were enemies we were *reconciled* to God by the death of his Son, much more, being *reconciled*, we shall be saved by his life:" then follows, "And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have received the *atonement*." Here then *atonement* is used as the answering substantive to the verb *to reconcile*. *Atonement*, is literally *at-one-ment*: the state of being *at one*, or *in agreement*.* Though the word *atonement* occurs but once in the New Testament, it is often used in the Old, but always in the sense of *reconciliation*. Doubtless, then, the atonement of Christian doctrine is *reconciliation with God*, including the means by which reconciliation is effected.

The writer whom I chiefly follow is pleased to affirm, that we deny this *ministry of reconciliation*; and quotes, as if they were against us, instead of being, as is the fact, entirely confirmatory of our doctrines, such texts as speak of the Lord Jesus Christ as having become a sacrifice for us, or as having, as Paul in one place explicitly states, "given himself as an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savor."† And he says "if we may not, as Baron Swedenborg would teach us, view Christ as a sacrifice for sin, then we require of the Swedenborgians to tell us, what the Mosaic sacrifices were types of: for according to their doctrine, those sacrificial types had no anti-types."‡ This sentence displays that utter ignorance respecting what our doctrines are, which so eminently distinguishes most of those who undertake to write against them. Our doctrines never teach that we may not view Christ as a sacrifice for sin; but they show, on the contrary, how he truly was such, and rectify the great mistakes which many entertain in regard to what a scriptural sacrifice is: and so far from making the Mosaic sacrifices types without anti-types, they bring their anti-types to view in a more clear and satisfactory manner than was ever before accomplished.

FIRST, then, we shall show, 'That the Sacrifices of the Mosaic law were not meant to represent the punishment of sin: but, on the contrary, That they represented the hallowing of every affection and principle of the mind, and thus of the whole man, to the Lord. SECONDLY, That the sacrifice of Jesus Christ did not consist in his suffering the punishment due to sin, but in his hallowing every principle of his Human Nature to the God-head, till at length his Human Nature became a living sacrifice, or thing fully consecrated, sanctified and hallowed, by perfect union with his Divinity. THIRDLY, We will answer some objec-

* See Acts vii. 26; 1 Macc. xiii 50; 2 Macc. i. 5, vii. 33.

† Eph. v. 2.

‡ P. 35.

tions, and further elucidate this Doctrine respecting Sacrifices in general, and the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ in particular.

I. FIRST, then, we are to show, *that the sacrifices of the Mosaic law were not meant to represent the punishment due to sin; but, on the contrary, That they represented the hallowing of every affection and principle of the mind, and thus of the whole man, to the Lord.*

The prevailing opinion in regard to the Levitical sacrifices is that first stated; that the slaying of the animal, and the burning of him, or of part of him, on the altar, represented the punishment due to the offerer, and that, in sacrificing the animal, the offerer was considered as entreating, that the suffering inflicted upon it might be accepted in lieu of the punishment deserved by himself. This is the notion which the Jewish Rabbins have of the subject; who say also, that a confession of sins was made over the victim, when the offerer laid his hand upon its head, and thus that the sins were considered as transferred to the animal, and punished in him instead of the offerer. It is however certain, that this is merely one of the traditions of the Jews, by which, as in so many instances, they have perverted the divine law; for although the offerer was commanded to lay his hand upon the head of the victim, *not one word is said in the Scriptures of any confession of sins to be then made.* The only instance in which a confession of sins accompanied the laying on of the hand, is that of the scape-goat; respecting which Moses commanded, that "Aaron should lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat."* But this goat being thus representatively loaded with sins, was considered as unclean, and, *instead of being sacrificed, was sent away into the wilderness*; even the man employed to send him away was viewed as contaminated by the operation, and rendered unclean also, so that he was required to wash his clothes and bathe his flesh in water, before he was allowed to return into the camp.† Seeing then, when it was intended that a confession of sins should be made over a victim, the command for it is so expressly given, can it be supposed that a similar confession was intended to be made over all the victims, when it is never commanded at all? And when the representative effect of this confession of sins over an animal was to render him unclean, so that to have offered him up in sacrifice would have been an abomination, and the only orderly way of disposing of him was to send him away into the wilderness, to denote

* Lev. xvi. 21.

† Ver. 20.

the rejection of man's sins, separated from himself, to hell from whence they came; can it be supposed that the animals actually sacrificed were in like manner rendered unclean, by a similar confession of sins being made over them, and thus a similar representative transfer of sins to them? The idea is monstrous in the extreme; it is such as could only have been invented by the Jews who wrote upon the ceremonies of the ancient law long after those ceremonies had ceased to be performed. The books of Jewish writers are full of similar groundless fancies, which either originated with themselves, or, if they are traditions handed down from others, belong to the class of those traditions which are condemned by the Lord Jesus Christ, as making the law of God of none effect.* Accordingly, the learned, who long mistakenly looked to the Jews as the natural expositors of the law of Moses, are now generally convinced, that to follow them is to follow blind guides indeed, and that the only way of learning how the laws of Moses were originally obeyed, is, by studying the laws themselves, as they are still extant in the books of Moses, and to take nothing upon the mere authority of the Jewish scribes which is not there clearly implied.† But, alas! the learned had not made the discovery, that Jews are very unsafe guides for Christians, before they had transferred a great portion of their doctrines into their system of Christianity. The Rabbinical notion that the animal slain in sacrifice was put to death in lieu of the offerer as a substituted victim, the sins of the offerer being considered as transferred to him, has entered very deeply into most systems of modern theology, and forms in them so fundamental a part, that you cannot take it away without throwing down the whole. Christian teachers, indeed, do not, with the Jews, consider that the slaying of an animal in sacrifice had any virtue in itself, but they transfer to the sufferings and death of Jesus on the cross, all that the Jews have feigned respecting their animal sacrifice. They consider that he died to appease, by his sufferings the wrath of the Father; that the sins of all mankind, that is, of all who have faith, were representatively transferred to him, and that he suffered the punishment of them in their stead: all which doctrines are drawn from the Jewish notions of sacrifices, and belong to those *traditions, by which the law of God is made of none effect.*

The reason then why, in all sacrifices, he that offered the sacrifice was directed to put his hand upon the head of the victim, was, not by that act representatively to transfer his sins, — for to do this the sins were to be confessed over him, and *that*

* Mark vii. 13.

† See Michaelis' "Commentaries on the laws of Moses," *passim*.

by positive command, as in the case of the scape-goat, — but to express communication between the offerer and his sacrifice, which was necessary to give the animal its representative efficacy. The animals offered in sacrifice represented the good affections of various kinds from which the Lord is to be worshiped; but without this symbol of communication between the offerer and the animal, the latter would not represent any good affection presented *by him*: to imply that the offerer himself wished to worship the Lord by and from the good affection which the animal represented, it was necessary that he should perform the representative rite of putting his hand upon its head; after which the animal represented a good affection cherished by him, and represented by him to the Lord, from a sincere acknowledgment that every thing good is from the Lord alone.

Now that this is the true idea of sacrificial worship, is evident from many parts of Scripture: We will just select one which is completely conclusive.

That the putting of the animal to death, with the burning of it upon the altar, does not represent the punishment due to the offerer, is clear from this circumstance, that the altar on which the sacrifices were offered, is called, in various places, “the table of the Lord.” Thus the Lord says by the prophet to the priests, because they brought blind, lame, sick, and torn animals for sacrifice, “Ye have profaned it (that is, the name of the Lord) in that ye say, The table of the Lord is polluted, and the fruit thereof, even his *meat*” (the meat observe of the Lord) “is contemptible.” Again: “Ye offer polluted *bread* upon mine altar, and ye say, wherein have we polluted thee?” The answer is, “in that ye say, The *table* of the Lord is contemptible.”* Nothing can be more clear, from these and numerous other instances, than that the things offered in sacrifice, and burnt upon the altar, were considered as constituting a *Feast*, were presented as upon a *table* for the Lord to eat, which he was considered to do when they were consumed by fire. This is the reason why it is so often said in Leviticus, that they were to be burnt “for a sweet smelling savor to the Lord.” They are expressly called the Lord’s *bread*, and his *meat*. Can, then, that which He is considered to accept as food be the punishment and torments of sinners? Could it be the punishment and torments of his own Son? To suppose that this is what is meant by the slaying of the animals and burning of them on the altar, is indeed to pollute and profane the Lord’s table; it is to suppose the altar to be a type of the regions of eternal misery, and to regard him who accepts the offerings upon the altar as the being who presides over, and enjoys with delight, the torments of

* Mal. i. 7—14

the lost. Indeed, when we consider the sacrifices in the light of food spread upon the Lord's table for his acceptance, as we find they are represented in the Word, we must necessarily see that no idea of punishment and torments is in them represented. The death of the victim is not regarded as to the idea of punishment, nor is its dying ever spoken of in the appointment of the ceremonial; but the slaying of it is merely considered as a necessary part of the preparation of it for food, and *no more conveys the idea of the punishment due to the person who offers it, than that idea is conveyed by the reaping of the corn which was to be presented in the offering of the first fruits*, and which, as well as the animal sacrifices, was consumed upon the altar. Preparation for food is in both cases what is implied. And when the sacrifices, whether consisting of the flesh of animals, or of corn, flour, or cakes, are placed upon the altar or table of the Lord they are considered simply in the light of viands of which the Lord is invited to partake.

What then are the viands of which the Lord can partake in reality? When any allusion is made in Scripture to his hunger, it means that his intense desire that his goodness and love should be received by mankind. On the occasion of his temptation in the wilderness it is said, that "when he had fasted forty days, he was afterwards *an hungered*;"* where his fasting refers to the depraved state of mankind and of the church in its entire desolation, and his hungering is his intense desire for man's salvation. The hunger of the Lord, then, is satisfied, when his love and goodness are received by mankind; and this is done, when man receives affections of goodness and truth from him, and returns them to him in sincere adoration, with the heartfelt acknowledgment that they are from him alone.†

Here then we have a clear idea of the purport of the sacrifices in use in the representative church, — an idea which explains the whole system, and banishes obscurity from every part; whereas, on the supposition that they represent the punishment due to sinners, and transferred from them to the Lord Jesus Christ, we find ourselves stumbling amid extravagances and inconsistencies at every step.

But it may perhaps be objected, that this view of the subject excludes all reference of the sacrifices to the Lord Jesus Christ. The direct contrary, however, is the fact. All the Mosaic law of Sacrifices was fulfilled in, and by the Lord Jesus Christ, in a super-eminent manner, and thus, in its highest sense it has reference to him. It is only in a subordinate sense, and as follow-

* Matt. iv. 2.

† See the above view of the sacrifices, and of the nature of the divine hunger, further illustrated in *the Plenary Inspiration of the Scriptures*, p. 489—507, and 524—528.

ers of him, that it has a spiritual fulfillment in us. We, in our subordinate degree, as walking after him, are to be sacrifices too ; but he is the great sacrifice of all.

When man continually receives from the Lord the graces of which He is the author, and ascribes all to him, in the manner represented by the sacrificial worship of the Mosaic law, when every affection and perception of his heart and mind of which the various kinds of sacrifices were representative, or himself in regard to such affections and perceptions, is thus continually hallowed to the Lord ; it follows that when his sanctification is completed, the whole man is thus devoutly consecrated. This is the state which the apostle exhorts us to attain, when he says "I beseech you, brethren, that ye present your bodies *a living sacrifice*, holy, acceptable unto God ; which is your reasonable service."* Such a *living sacrifice* is a man wholly devoted to the Lord, who is wholly renewed by the reception of new principles of love, thought, and action, from him ; whose selfish life is extinct, whilst he lives by a new life, which is life indeed. This, the same apostle speaks of as being his own state when he says, "I am crucified with Christ : nevertheless I live ; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me ; and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me ;"† where, by *the flesh*, and, in the preceding quotation, by the *body*, the apostle, as in other parts of his writings, does not merely mean the material body, but all that is called the natural or external man. Here then he clearly describes a state of renovation of the whole man, in which he is made a living sacrifice unto God.

II. We shall now be enabled to see the truth of our SECOND proposition : *That the sacrifice of Jesus Christ did not consist in his suffering the punishment due to sin*, — for if, as we have seen, nothing relating to punishment is included in the Scripture idea of sacrifices, nothing of this could be included in the sacrifice of Jesus Christ ; — but *That his sacrifice consisted in the hallowing of every principle or element of his Human Nature to the Godhead, till at length his whole Human Nature became a living sacrifice, or thing fully consecrated, sanctified, and hallowed, by perfect union with his Divinity*.

We have seen in the last SECTION, that whilst the human form which the Lord assumed by birth of the virgin, necessarily partook, at first, of her infirmities, its soul, from conception, was no other than the indivisible Jehovah. So long, then, as has also been shown, as the human form, thus assumed, partook at all of what is derived from the mother, it could only receive the communications of the Divine Essence with more or

* Rom. xii. 1.

less of limitation: in order to its receiving the whole, and becoming properly the Divine Form of the Divine Essence, it was necessary that it should be entirely renewed, by the successive extirpation of the disorderly and finite human forms, and the bringing down, from the Divinity within, of divine forms, into the human and natural degree, to supply their place. To this operation the Lord Jesus alludes on various occasions. Sometimes he refers to the painful part of it, which was the extirpation of what he had from the mother; as when he says, "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!"* At other times he speaks of the glorious part; as when he says, "Father, glorify me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."† And that this was necessary for man's salvation, he declares when he says, "For their sakes *I sanctify myself*; that they also may be sanctified through the truth;"‡ where, by sanctifying himself, the Lord means, his purifying his Humanity from the infirmities inherited from the mother, and thus making it Divine. The same thing is frequently spoken of by the apostles: as by Paul, when he speaks of Jesus as being "made perfect through sufferings;"§ the *sufferings* were the temptations and conflicts by which he put off the imperfections inherited from the mother: and the *making perfect* was his rendering the Humanity the perfect image, the appropriate Form and proper Person, of his Divine Soul. The last suffering, by which he wholly put off all that he had received from the mother, was the passion of the cross. By this, all the merely natural life of the finite and material nature was extinguished: and when this was done, the Divine Life flowing from within, (every thing uncongenial with it being extinct), descended into the most extreme forms of the human nature, extirpated all that was yet left from the mother, clothed itself with divine forms, still belonging to the human and natural degree, put on in place of what was put off; and so raised his Body from the tomb, no longer finite, no longer liable to any of the accidents of the mere creature, but wholly Divine, the adequate Form for the reception and in-dwelling of the whole Divine Essence. This is his "Glorious Body," as it is called by the Apostle, after the image of which our spiritual bodies are to be fashioned. Some idea of it may also be conceived from the glorious view granted to the three disciples at the transfiguration: || what was seen by them was the Divine Person in the sphere immediately within, and above, that of the material frame. In this Divine Form and Person, therefore, as the Apostle declares, "all the fullness

* Luke xii. 50.

† John xvii. 5.

‡ Ver. 19.

§ Phil. iii. 21.

|| Matt. xvii. 2.

of the Godhead dwelleth bodily :” — in any form and body not altogether divine, it is obviously impossible that *ALL the fullness of the Godhead — the whole infinitude of the Divine Nature* — can dwell. If ALL is centered in the Person of Jesus ; demonstrating that his Person, since his resurrection, is altogether Divine ; how vain then must it be to look for the Godhead any where else, than in that Divine Form in which the whole of it dwells !

Now admitting this view of the completeness of the sanctification, glorification, or deification, of the Lord’s Human Nature to be correct ; and admitting at the same time the view above developed of the nature and effect of real spiritual sacrifices as offered by man ; and we clearly see how truly the Lord, as to his Humanity, is called a sacrifice. The series of the Mosaic sacrifices, in their complete order, represents the entire sanctification of man, insomuch that the man who spiritually offers them becomes himself a sacrifice, — a thing or being wholly devoted to God, and wholly assimilated, in his finite degree, to the divine image : so, in a higher sense, it represents the complete sanctification or glorification of the Lord’s Humanity, whereby this was really devoted to the Divine Essence itself, and entirely assimilated to the Divine Nature, so as to be the actual Form for its bodily indwelling. And this is correctly said to be done for *us* ; for us this sacrifice was offered, to effect atonement, or reconciliation, between man and God : as Jesus says, “*for their sakes I sanctify myself ;*” and as Paul declares, “Christ our passover is sacrificed *for us* :” not because the Father’s anger required appeasing, or could be appeased by the sight of the Son’s sufferings ; but because, when the Humanity was thus sacrificed, that is sanctified, and united to the Essential Divinity, the divine influences were accommodated to man’s state, so as to be operative to the renewal of his heart and mind, — to *his* sanctification also. Thus it is most true, as the Apostle observes, that “he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.” It is to put away sin from the mind which receives him that the Holy Spirit is given : and of this it is said, while Jesus was engaged in his ministry on earth, “the Holy Ghost was not yet, because that Jesus was not yet glorified :” * — not that no divine influences had ever before been afforded ; but that such as were adapted to reach and affect man in the state to which he had then fallen, could not be imparted, till the Humanity of Jesus, the only Divine Principal from which *such* influences can be given, was glorified, that is, sacrificed, that is, deified.

* John vii. 59. Our translators have said, “was not yet *given* ;” but they have marked the word *given* by Italics, to intimate that there is nothing answering to it in the original.

The above observations may also sufficiently explain, how it is that man is saved through the sufferings and death of the Lord Jesus Christ; or through his blood, which, in the Apostolic writings, is constantly used, according to the phraseology of the Jews, as a figurative expression for his sufferings and death. These were not inflicted on him as the proper punishment of our sins: yet were they most truly undergone by him *for us*, and were indispensable to our salvation. They, and especially his last suffering of death, were the means by which his Humanity was glorified. They thus were the means by which we are delivered from hell and raised to heaven, through our reception of the saving graces communicated by the life-giving energies of the Holy Spirit; which could only be imparted to us from the Eternal Jehovah in his Glorified Humanity. Thus it is most strictly true, according to our apprehensions of the subject, that “by his stripes, we are healed.”

III. In the first edition of this work, I here concluded my observations on this subject, conceiving that I had offered enough to make our views of it intelligible, and to evince that they are satisfactory. Yet, the ideas being so new to the generality of readers, I have experienced that it is possible, even for some of the Candid and Reflecting, to retain doubts on some of the points advanced. A writer of this description, taking the signature of *Omega*, propounded some objections and inquiries, in the Intellectual Repository. Owing to the small degree of acquaintance which is possessed, even by readers of the Scriptures, with those parts of them which, treat of sacrifices, it is more than probable, that the solution of the questions proposed by *Omega* will be useful to many more. I will therefore insert, here, with slight omissions and alterations, the article which I wrote in reply to that friendly inquirer;* and will thus, as proposed, in THE THIRD PLACE, *answer some objections, and further elucidate this Doctrine respecting Sacrifices in general, and the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ in particular.*

“The first difficulty proposed by ‘Omega’ is upon the following passage of the ‘Appeal:’ ‘The sacrifices of the Mosaic law were not meant to represent the punishment of sin, but, on the contrary, the hallowing of every affection and principle of the mind, and thus of the whole man, to the Lord.’ On this *Omega* writes, ‘This appears to me eminently clear and beautiful in regard to the free-will offerings; but not exactly so in respect to the sin-offerings. Mr. Noble, I think, makes no distinction between those,’ &c.

“I was somewhat surprised, on reading the above, that the writer should have thought that I considered there to be no dis-

* Int. Rep. for Sept. 1832, pp. 229, &c.

inction between the sin and free-will offerings. In the 'Appeal' (p. 481*), I had written thus: 'The *series* of the Mosaic sacrifices, in *their complete order*, represents the entire sanctification of man,' &c. I meant to say, that this was not fully represented by any one species of sacrifice, but by them altogether, one stage of the process of regeneration being represented by one, and another by another. So far from wishing to confound together the sin-offering, the burnt-offering, and the peace-offering, with the various kinds of each, I am of opinion that the existence of so many kinds of sacrifices affords one of the strongest arguments against the common notion, that they all typify, simply, the death of Jesus Christ, and the sufferings therein undergone by him as a substitute for sinners. The following is an extract from a Lecture, composed and delivered prior to the publication of the Appeal, in which I urge this argument, together with that arising from the manner in which the Lord's crucifixion took place.

" 'It really seems extraordinary that it should ever have been imagined, that the sacrifices of the Levitical law represented the punishment due to the sins of man as transferred to a substitute, and had reference to the death of the Lord Jesus Christ and nothing more, when there are so many circumstances connected with them which are utterly incompatible with either supposition. For instance: If they were all instituted merely to pre-figure the crucifixion of the Lord Jesus Christ, how came there to be so much variety in them? The crucifixion of the Lord was performed in one particular manner, and was one single act. If then Divine Wisdom designed to pre-figure it by the sacrifice of animals, why was not one instituted which should answer to it with some degree of nearness? What occasion for a multitude of ceremonies connected with each, none of which bore any resemblance, in any respect, to the crucifixion of the Saviour?

" But further: The sacrifices of the law are considered as being offered by the real members of the church, as means of obtaining the divine favor for themselves. They were regarded as acts of sincere worship and true veneration for their God, and the actual sacrificing was executed by the priests, considered as the Lord's chosen servants. Whereas the crucifixion of Jesus was procured by the greatest enemies to God and goodness, and involved, on their parts, an absolute denial of their Maker as well as of the Redeemer; whilst the immediate execution was performed by Roman soldiers, profane Gentiles. Thus the idolatrous soldiers must be considered as performing the part of the sacrificing priests, the consecrated sons of Levi;

* In the present edition, p. 460.

whilst the traitor Judas and the accusing chief priests and scribes, being the parties by whom the sacrifice was offered, were the true worshipers on the occasion! How groundless, then, must be the notion, that the Jewish sacrifices *strictly* represent the death of the Lord, when we see what absurd consequences result from such a supposition!

“Another circumstance which proves that the death of Jesus on the cross could not be strictly represented by the sacrifices of the Mosaic law, is this. A great part of those sacrifices consisted, not of slaughtered animals, but of offerings upon the altar of flour and oil. Indeed, these were the most essential part of the sacrificial worship; for while these, denominated meat-offerings, might be presented without any animal sacrifice, no animal sacrifice could be accepted without an accompanying meat offering.* There were also offerings of the first-fruits of the harvest. Now it certainly is impossible to conceive how such offerings as these could have any reference to the death on the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ. Does it not then appear unquestionable, that the sacrifice of animals must have represented things of the same nature, though with a variety as to their kind, as the offerings of cakes and fruits; and as these cannot strictly represent the literal death of Jesus on the cross, so neither can the other.’

“I know not whether, from *the sort* of distinction which ‘Omega’ seems inclined to recognise between the sin-offering and the other sacrifices, he is of opinion that, though the sacrifices in general represent the worship of the Lord from the good affections typified by the animals sacrificed, yet the sin-offering may have a particular reference of a different nature, and may represent the death of Jesus Christ as a vicarious suffering for the sins of mankind. If so, it perhaps may be sufficient to observe, that the principal sin-offering was a bullock, and no other animal than a bullock could be accepted as a sin-offering for the whole congregation,† except the goat on the annual day of expiation.‡ A lamb was only allowed to be used as a substitute for a kid, and merely as the sin-offering of a private individual; and then it was required to be a *female*.§ If then, of all the sacrifices, the sin-offering was that which chiefly or alone referred to the Lord Jesus Christ and his death, — when John pointed him out to the Jews, instead of saying, ‘Behold the *Lamb* of God, which taketh away the sins of the world,’|| he ought to have said, ‘Behold the *Bullock*,’ or ‘*Goat*.’ As the Divine Saviour is never called, or compared to, a bullock or goat, the proper animals of the sin-offering, it is quite plain that the sin-offering could have no particular reference to him, and

* Numb. x. 2—12.

† Lev. iv. 14.

‡ Ch. xvi. 5, 15.

§ Ch. iv. 28, 32.

|| John i. 29.

to his death on the cross ; and it becomes very certain that the sin-offering could not be intended at all to typify this, considered as a vicarious suffering for the sins of mankind. He is called a Lamb, among other reasons, because the lamb was the animal sacrificed on the continual burnt-offering ; and a whole burnt-offering represented something wholly devoted and consecrated to the Lord, as was his humanity to his Divinity ; whereas, in the sin-offerings, a small part of the animal only was consumed upon the altar. The common doctrine of the vicarious nature of the Lord's sufferings and death, and of the reference thereto of the ancient sacrifices, certainly requires, that, of all the sacrifices, the sin-offering should have the most pointed relation to that subject : and yet, of all the sacrifices, the sin-offering is that in which it is most difficult to trace any relation to it whatever.

“ On the nature of the distinction between the various kinds of offerings, I will submit another extract from the Lecture cited before.

“ The Jewish sacrifices were intended to represent the worship of the Lord from the affections and perceptions of a purified heart and mind ; which essentially consists in the ascription of all heavenly graces to the Lord as their Author. But what is the effect of such a worshiping of the Lord ? what, but the renewal of the heart and mind, so that it is filled with heavenly graces derived from him, and justly acknowledged to be from him alone ? And what is this but regeneration ; that is, the passing from a merely natural state to a spiritual one, the whole man being renewed by the reception and appropriation of heavenly graces from the Lord ? This renewal, or this regeneration, is then represented by the sacrifices of the Levitical code, considered in their regular series.

“ “ The sacrifices consisted, in general, of three kinds, — sin-offerings (to which general class the trespass-offering also belonged) burnt-offerings and peace-offerings. In the sin-offerings, part of the animal sacrificed was burnt upon the altar, and the other parts were either burnt without the camp or eaten by the priests, according to circumstances ; but in no case was any of it eaten by the offerer. In the burnt-offering, the whole was consumed upon the altar, and none was eaten either by the offerer or by the priest. In the peace-offering, the same parts as in the sin-offering were burnt upon the altar, part of the remainder was given to the priest, and the rest was eaten by the person who offered it. And it is to be observed, that this was the order in which the sacrifices, when all the kinds were offered, took place ; first a sin-offering, next a burnt-offering, and lastly a peace-offering ; as is particularly directed on occasion of the consecration of the high

priest.* Now, to those who are acquainted with the order in which the regeneration of man proceeds, it is easy to discern herein a picture of the whole. The order in which man proceeds is from *externals* to *internals*, and afterwards from *internals* to *externals*, he being then in both together. When he begins to do the work of repentance, there is an inward principle of love and faith from the Lord, which prompts him to resist evils and to live as the divine commandments enjoin : but to do so he feels as a laborious effort ; because, at the beginning, he is only sensible of natural delights, to resist which appears irksome and painful. Still there must be, in the interiors of the soul, a love of the opposite good, from which he acts ; though this is as yet unattended with delight in the seat of his conscious perceptions. This state then is represented by the sin-offerings. The part of the animal which was burnt upon the altar, represented the inward good received from the Lord, from which man does the work of repentance ; though the smallness of its quantity denotes that this is as yet but little ; while the large quantity which was either burnt without the camp or given to the priest, according to circumstances, none coming to the share of the offerer, denotes the imperfect degree in which the lower principles of the mind are yet purified. The next great state attained in the regenerate life, is, when the influence of natural loves is entirely destroyed, and when man is consequently enabled to look to the Lord with his whole heart, both in the interiors and exteriors of his mind, thus, when the union of good with truth is effected, and truth is no longer, as in the former state, the apparently reigning principle. Still, though there is thus a great increase in the reception of good within the soul, there is not a full sensation of delight in it in the lower regions of the mind ; and though man is enabled to elevate the whole to the Lord, still this is not attended with a full perception of blessedness in doing so. This is represented by the burnt-offerings, in which the whole of the animal was consumed upon the altar, and no share was returned to the offerer himself. The final state is that, in which the external man, being entirely brought into order, and no longer retaining either affections or delights at variance with those of the internal, is renewed and vivified by the reception in it of the affections and delights of the internal ; when love to the Lord and charity to man, in company with a pure and exalted faith, are not only become the ruling motives of the heart, but when the practice of the conduct which such motives prescribe is not only adopted by the external as a matter of duty and necessity, but is felt to be attended with the utmost enjoyment and delight. This was rep-

* Ex. xxix.

resented by the sacrifices of peace-offerings, in which the inward parts were burnt upon the altar, and the flesh was eaten by the offerer. This is expressive of a state of complete regeneration, being the same as is spoken of by the Lord in the Revelation, when he says, "I will sup with him and he with me." The Lord sups with man, when he infuses into him the heavenly affections and views of which He is the sole author; and man sups with the Lord, when he feels what is thus imparted to him as if it were his own, willing what the Lord wills, and taking delight in all that the Lord's will requires.

"Thus, then, it is evident, that the performance of the Levitical sacrifices represented the offering up of man's self to the Lord; first in the sin-offering, partially; next in the burnt-offering, wholly; and finally in the peace-offering, is seen the result of his full renewal into the divine image, when what he had offered is, as it were, given back to him; or rather, something far better in its place.*"

"I have dwelt at some length on the first of Omega's paragraphs of difficulties, as containing the whole essence of the subject; the remainder may be more briefly disposed of.

"He next cites a passage from the 'Appeal,' in which it is stated, that '*in all sacrifices*, he that offered the sacrifice was directed to put his hand upon the head of the victim.' He asks whether this assertion is not incorrect; and refers to twenty-five places in Leviticus, in which, he states, 'we read of the sacrifices without any accompaniment of the laying on of hands;' upon which he says, 'Concerning these I would ask, as Mr. N. does of confession, 'Seeing then, when it was intended that hands should be laid upon a victim, the command for it is so expressly given, can it be supposed that a similar laying on of hands was intended in all these places, where it is never commanded at all?'

"If I could have been guilty of such an oversight as to make a general assertion in the face of such a host of passages proving the contrary, I should very justly have deserved to have my own words turned against myself, as is here done by 'Omega.' I believe, however, that not one of his twenty-five texts proves the circumstance for which he refers to them. There were, we have seen, in the whole, but three general classes of sacrifices, — sin-offerings, burnt-offerings, and peace-offerings. The trespass-offering was only a species of sin-offering, and is ex-

* The above, I believe, will be found to agree in substance, though more popularly expressed, with what Swedenborg has taught upon the subject. I have noticed above, that a sacrifice of each kind was directed to be offered at the consecration of Aaron, Exodus xxix; and that chapter is explained at large, in the beginning of the last volume of the "*Arcana Coelestia*."

pressly declared to be a sin-offering.* The law respecting the burnt-offering is given in Leviticus i., and it is there said of the offerer, 'He shall put his hand on the head of the burnt-offering.'† The law of peace-offering is prescribed in Lev. iii., and it is there said of the offerer, 'He shall lay his hand upon the head of his offering.'‡ The law of the sin-offering is delivered in chap. iv. Respecting the sin-offering for a priest, it is commanded, that he shall lay his hand upon the bullock's head.§ Respecting that for the whole congregation, 'that the elders of the congregation shall lay their hands upon the head of the bullock.'|| Respecting that for a ruler, that 'he shall lay his hand upon the head of the goat.'¶ Respecting that for one of the common people, which was to be a female kid or lamb, that 'he shall lay his hand upon the head of the sin-offering.'** Respecting the trespass-offering, which as already noticed, was a species of sin-offering, it is commanded, 'As is the sin-offering, so is the trespass-offering. There is one law for them.'††

"We find it then expressly commanded, respecting all the kinds of animal sacrifices, that the offerer should lay his hand upon the head of the victim. How is it then that Omega has been able to discover twenty-five instances, in which this was not required? An examination of any one of his instances will evince his mistake.

"His first instance is from Lev. v. 5, 6: 'and it shall be, when he shall be guilty in one of these things, that he shall confess that he hath sinned in that thing: and he shall bring his trespass-offering unto the Lord for his sin, which he hath sinned, a female of the flock, a lamb or a kid of the goats, for a sin-offering: and the priest shall make an atonement for him concerning his sin.' Here, certainly, nothing is said about the offerer's laying his hand upon the head of the victim: neither is anything said respecting the slaying of it, the putting the blood upon the horns of the altar, and pouring out of the remainder at the bottom of the altar, the burning of certain parts upon the altar, and the like. Did none of these things then take place? In other words, was not the animal sacrificed at all? Unquestionably it was, and with all proper ceremonials. But these are not repeated here, because they are contained in the directions before laid down as to the mode of proceeding in the sacrificing of a sin-offering. The manner in which a sin-offering was to be made having once been described, it were superfluous indeed to repeat the description on every occasion when a sin-offering

* Lev. v. 6, 7, 8, 9.

† Ver. 4.

‡ Ver. 2, 8, 13.

§ Ver. 4.

|| Ver. 15.

¶ Ver. 24

** Ver. 20, 33.

†† Chapter vii. 7.

is commanded to be presented. All the other instances referred to by Omega are of the same description: they are only specific occasions on which *a trespass, or sin-offering*;* or *a burnt-offering*,† is directed to be offered;‡ of course, the mode of making the offering was to be that which is prescribed where the law upon the subject is expressly delivered. The *name* of the sacrifice was a sufficient direction as to the mode of offering it.

“The statement, then, that in all sacrifices the offerer was directed to put his hand upon the head of the victim, remains unaffected by all the places in which Omega says we read of the sacrifice of animals without this accompaniment. There is, however, one instance, not noticed by him, in which there might be room to doubt whether this was intended. This is in the command about burnt-offerings of the flock.§ Respecting a burnt-offering of the herd, it is directed, in a passage, already cited, that the offerer should put his hand upon its head,|| but this command is not repeated when directions are given, immediately afterwards, about the burnt-offering of the flock. But whatever was the reason for this omission, it seems unquestionable that the command was intended to apply in both cases: indeed we find a command to the effect in Ex. xxix. 15; and the accordant practice in Lev. viii. 18.

“Omega next cites a passage from Arc. Coel. 10,023, in which it is said, that ‘by the laying of their hand upon the burnt-offering and sacrifice was signified the all of the worship of him who offered, viz., the acknowledgment of sins, confession,’ &c. But because, in the case of the scape-goat, the imposition and confession over him rendered him unclean, and unfit for the purpose of sacrifice, he asks, ‘How are we to understand the confession implied in the laying on of hands, here spoken of; the tendency of which was to cleanse, not to defile the animal?’

Respecting the scape-goat, the command is, ‘And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, *putting them upon the head of the goat.*’¶ Here is not merely an implied, but an actual and particular confession, accompanied with a suitable ac-

* Ch. v. 16, 18; vi. 6; xii. 6, 8; xiv. 13, 22, 25, 31; xv. 30; xvi. 6, 11, 15; xix. 22.

† Ch. xii. 6, 8; xiv. 19, 20, 22, 31; xv. 30; xxiii. 27.

“‡ Some of the places relate to offerings of birds. Respecting these it is never commanded that the offerer should lay his hand upon their head, because this action could only be conveniently performed upon a quadruped, and the presenting of the bird with his own hand to the priest had the same signification.”

§ Lev. i. 10, &c.

|| Ver. 4.

¶ Lev. 16, 21.

tion, expressly intended to transfer, representatively, the sins of the people to the animal: whereas nothing of the kind is involved in the acknowledgment and confession mentioned by Swedenborg, as forming part of the worship included in the representation of laying the hand of an offerer upon his sacrifice. There can be no worship at all without acknowledgment and confession, either express or implied: if, therefore, the sacrificing of an animal represented the worship of the offerer, and derived this representation from his laying his hand upon it, it must represent his acknowledgment and confession as part of his worship. What was thus representatively transferred to the animal was, not the worshiper's sins, but the good from which all self-acknowledgment proceeds, — the good of humility and of innocence.

“ ‘In Lev. v. 1—6,’ says Omega, ‘there is a specification of several sins, with directions that the offender should *confess his sin*, and bring an offering to the Lord; but there is no mention of *the laying on of hands*:’ and he asks, ‘how is this passage to be understood?’

“ Part of it has been cited above, and the error corrected of supposing, that, in this case, there was no laying on of hands. What has been observed just above, about confession as a part of worship, will apply here. A person has been in a state of evil or defilement, either knowingly or otherwise. In the latter case, when it comes to his knowledge, he is to employ the means of purification, as well as in the former. No one can be purified from any evil who does not acknowledge it to be an evil. Such acknowledgment, then, is meant by his being required to confess it. He is then enabled to worship the Lord from the good of that confession, or from the good of repentance: which was represented by the trespass-offering which he was then directed to bring.

“ Omega finds his last difficulty in Ps. xxxvii. 20: ‘but the wicked shall perish, and the *enemies* of the Lord shall be as the *fat of lambs*; they shall consume, into smoke shall they consume away.’ But the only difficulty arises from supposing, that the fat of lambs, as consumed in divinely representative sacrifices is what is meant: and there would indeed be a difficulty in seeing how this could be a proper symbol of the enemies of the Lord. But there is nothing either in the text or context to intimate that the fat of lambs is here spoken of in reference to ‘its application to the most holy use.’ Most things in the Word admit of opposite significations: and if, in its good sense, the fat of lambs signifies the good of innocence of celestial love, in its contrary sense it will denote an evil which is opposite to such

innocence. If there is here any reference to the burning of fat in sacrifices at all, the sacrifices alluded to must be those of the enemies of the Lord offered to false gods and idols.

“I hope that the above remarks may be received as tending to show, that no solid objection can be raised to the New Church Doctrine of Atonement, and that no support for the common erroneous doctrine can be derived from any just view of the sacrifices of the Mosaic law.”

From the whole, then, that has been offered on the subject of sacrifices, I trust we may now discern, how truly atonement, or reconciliation was made between God and man by the sacrifice of Jesus Christ. The enmity, or contrariety, between man and God, was first abolished in his own person, and in him man or human nature in general, was reconciled to God :* and then, by his agency and influence, it is abolished in us also, and we are reconciled, and restored to agreement with God, in and by him. In the expressive language of the apostle ;† “If, when we were enemies” — when human nature in general was in a state of contrariety, — “we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son,” — the separation was abolished by the glorification of the human nature of the Lord Jesus Christ, which is the Son of God, and of which glorification his death was the immediate cause, — “much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by his life,” — much more now that the utter separation no longer exists, shall we be endowed with saving graces through the life giving influences proceeding from Him, who ever liveth to make intercession for us. What reason then, have we to “joy in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, BY WHOM WE HAVE NOW RECEIVED THE ATONEMENT !”‡ Blessed be GOD who “HATH ATONED US TO HIMSELF BY JESUS CHRIST !” Adored be the mercy, by which GOD WAS IN CHRIST ATONING THE WORLD UNTO HIMSELF !”§

* See this truth which is usually so entirely overlooked largely proved and insisted on in *Sherlock on Happiness and Punishment in the Next World*, Ch. v. § 2.

† Rom. v. 10.

‡ Ver. 11.

§ See above, p. 419.

SECTION VIII.

THE ATONEMENT, SACRIFICE AND MEDIATION OF JESUS CHRIST.

PART II.

Other Modes of Atonement, beside that by Sacrifices, mentioned in the Scripture.

ATONEMENT, we have seen, according to the meaning of the word in the Scripture use of it, and the only meaning which it bore at the time of translating the Scriptures into English, is Reconciliation. Consequently, "The Atonement of Christian Doctrine is Reconciliation with God, including the means by which reconciliation is effected." But in consequence of the erroneous views which have been introduced into religious systems respecting the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ, and its being supposed that he underwent the punishment of our sins as a substituted victim, to appease the wrath of another Divine person, the word "Atonement" has come to be confined, in common use, to express this unfounded idea. Whenever atonement is now spoken of by religious persons, they always mean by it, the appeasement of divine wrath, by Jesus Christ's suffering the punishment due to sinners, as their substitute or in their stead, — the innocent for the guilty. And because the word is often used in the Old Testament, or in the Levitical law, in connection with the sacrifices, it is concluded that *this* — the substitution of one being to undergo the punishment incurred by another — is what Atonement really means. The erroneous-ness of this notion has already been amply shown, in the exposition that has been given of the true nature of Sacrifices; and it may easily be proved by other means: For there are several other modes of making atonement, beside that of sacrifices, mentioned in the Old Testament. An examination of these will establish, beyond all doubt, what Atonement, in Scripture really means. To this, therefore, we will devote a short PART of this SECTION.

1. The first instance of other modes of Atonement beside that of sacrifices, occurs in Ex. xxx. 10—16. It is there commanded, when the children of Israel were numbered, that “they should give every man a *ransom for his soul*, unto the Lord, that there be no plague among them.” They were to give for this purpose, *half-a-shekel* apiece. “The rich (it is said) shall not give more, and the poor shall not give less, than half-a-shekel, when they give an offering unto the Lord, *to make an atonement for your souls.*” This is expressly called, their “*atonement money.*” This every one was to pay for himself. There was here no substitution of one being for another, — no death or punishment inflicted on any thing: but to avert the plague of death with which they would have been visited, had they, under that representative dispensation, attempted to ascertain their strength, by counting their numbers, without any symbolic act implying their dependence for life and existence on the Lord, the payment of the half-shekel, for the service of the tabernacle, was required. The half-shekel, which was a piece of silver, represented the truth, reverently acknowledged, that man derives his life, with all the endowments which accompany it, and especially all power in spiritual conflicts, from the Lord, and is continually dependent for it on him; the non-acknowledgment of which dependence includes the privation of spiritual life: and the payments being the same for all, for rich and poor alike, was to express that the life of all, especially the spiritual life, is of equal value in the eyes of the Lord, that the souls of all are equally precious in his sight, that rich and poor, the highly or the poorly gifted either with worldly wealth or with mental endowments, are all equal before Him, and that he equally regards the life, especially the eternal life, of every one of his rational creatures. To retain eternal life, man must acknowledge that he derives it from the Lord. This, every one must do for himself, not another for him. The piece of silver representing this acknowledgment, is expressly denominated his “*atonement money:*” and the giving of it is most pointedly declared to be done “*to make an atonement for your souls.*” By doing that *spiritually*, then, which this natural action *represented*, every one *makes an atonement for his own soul.*

Thus this circumstance of the payment of atonement-money, is alone a sufficient proof, that no such idea as that commonly attached, in modern times, to the word *atonement*, belongs to it as used in Scripture. No allusion to substitution, to a vicarious undergoing of punishment, can possibly be *here* intended. Neither is any such thing intended, when it is said in the directions about sacrifices, that a man’s offering “shall be ac-

cepted to *make an atonement for him.*"* The animal, in this case, represents a principle of goodness from which man offers an acceptable worship to the Lord; just as, in regard to the atonement-money, the piece of silver denotes the truth, as confessed by the giver, that man owes his life, spiritual as well as natural, to the Lord as its Source: and there is no more allusion to the undergoing of punishment by one being instead of a different being, in the one case than there is in the other.

2. In another instance, we find the *prayers of Moses* described as *making atonement for the sins of the people*. How inconsistent is this with all that is so frequently said about Moses in the common doctrines of the day! Moses is usually described as the accuser, of mankind, as bringing them into condemnation; *not as making atonement for them!* He is perpetually represented as something like an antagonist of the Lord Jesus Christ; as delivering a law, at the command of the angry Father, to bring all men under a curse; not as an intercessor, who mediates to deliver them, and to "make an atonement for their sin." Yet, according to the Word of God, this he actually did. After Israel had sinned so grievously in the affair of the golden calf, and three thousand men had been slain in consequence, it is written thus: "And it came to pass on the morrow, that Moses said unto the people, Ye have sinned a great sin: and now I will go up unto the Lord, peradventure I shall make *an atonement for your sin.*"† What plainer proof can be desired, that, in the Scripture sense of the expression, the word Atonement does not mean, the suffering as a substituted victim for the sin of others? Moses, most certainly never thought of making atonement in the way that the Lord Jesus Christ is supposed to have done, by suffering in his own person the punishment due to the sins of the people: yet he certainly did undertake to endeavor to make an *atonement*. But all is easy when it is known, that the proper sense of *atonement* is *reconciliation* or *agreement*, without any specific mode of causing such agreement or reconciliation. How did Moses proceed with *his* work of atonement? The sacred narrative adds, "And Moses returned unto the Lord, and said, Oh, this people have sinned a great sin, and have made them gods of gold. Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written."‡ Moses certainly does here *offer himself for death*. But how? as a substitute for the people, and that his death might be accepted *instead of theirs*? Did he thus adopt the common perverted sense of the word *Atonement*, and pray that *he* might be

* As Lev. i. 4.

† Ex. xxxii. 30.

‡ Ver. 31, 32.

punished in order that *they* might go free? Moses had too just ideas of the nature and character of the gracious and holy God with whom he interceded, to dream of insulting his justice and his truth by any such proposal. He simply and humbly acknowledges the sin of the people, and entreats the Lord to forgive it: "Oh, this people have sinned a great sin: — yet now if thou wilt forgive their sin;" which is a Hebrew form of speaking, meaning: "O that thou *wouldst* forgive their sin!" And when he desires that he might be blotted out of the Lord's book, it is not that he might perish instead of the people, but along with them. He endeavors to *make atonement*, by simply *entreating the Lord to forgive the people*: but "if not, (he says), — if (the Lord can) not (forgive them, he exclaims) blot me, I pray thee out of thy book which thou hast written." To think of making *atonement* for them by desiring to *die in their stead*, or *as the punishment for their sin*, he knows were impossible and absurd: he therefore only attempts to make atonement for them by prayer: should which be unsuccessful, he desires, out of his Great love for them, to be permitted to die, or forfeit the Divine favor, together with them, to share their fate. And the Lord in his answer rejects the idea of one person's dying through the sins of others in any way, saying, "Whosoever hath sinned against me, *him* will I blot out of my book."*

Again then is it impossible to doubt, that, in the ideas of Moses, and not only of Moses, but of Jehovah himself, *atonement* means nothing like *suffering by substitution*: it signifies the effecting of *agreement or reconciliation, by means really worthy of justice, mercy, and truth*.

3. But other instances are at hand which still fully prove, that the word *atonement*, as used in the books of Moses, contains no idea whatever of the suffering, by one being, of the punishment due to the sins of another.

Unwarned by the melancholy death of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, for their ungrateful and presumptuous rebellion, the congregation murmured the next day against Moses and Aaron saying, "Ye have killed the people of the Lord."† A plague in consequence immediately commenced, which speedily destroyed above fourteen thousand of the people, and would have consumed the whole. But "Moses said unto Aaron, Take a censer, and put fire therein from off the altar, and put on incense, and go quickly unto the congregation, and *make an atonement* for them: for there is wrath gone out from the Lord; the plague is begun. And Aaron (it proceeds) took as Moses commanded, and ran into the midst of the congregation: and

* Ver. 33.

† Num. xvi. 41.

behold, the plague was begun among the people : and he put on incense, *and made an atonement for the people*. And he stood between the dead and the living : and the plague was stayed.* Here again it is quite clear, that atonement, as the word is used in Scripture according to its own proper signification, does not include any idea of the substitution of one being to undergo punishment in lieu of another who has deserved it, — anything like the infliction of vicarious suffering. The Israelites were dying by thousands ; and Aaron “*made atonement for them,*” as is explicitly said, though neither he nor any other being died or suffered in their stead. *His* atonement consisted in nothing more, than burning incense kindled with fire from the altar, between the dead and the living : an action expressive of the remission of sins by the Lord, from no other prompting or intercession than that of his own divine love.

4. On other occasions, when plagues were raging, “*atonement,*” it is said, was effected, by making notable examples of the chief offenders or their representatives. Thus when Israel had flagrantly transgressed, and a plague had broken out which destroyed 24,000 of the people, Phinehas, the son of Eleazer, the son of Aaron, inflamed with zeal, slew one of the most flagrant of the transgressors upon the spot ; for which he is promised an everlasting priesthood, “*because, (as the words run) he was zealous for his God, and made an atonement for the children of Israel.*”† And when there was a famine in the time of David, declared to have been caused by the cruelties of Saul to the Gibeonites, and David asked the injured parties, “*where-with shall I make the atonement,* that ye may bless the inheritance of the Lord,” it was done *by executing seven of Saul’s sons.*‡

Thus again it is most palpable, that no idea of the suffering by one party of the punishment due to the sins of another, in order that the guilty may go free, is included in the meaning of *atonement*, as the word is used in Scripture. In the case of the atonement made by Phinehas, it was effected not by putting to death an innocent person or animal instead of the real offenders, but by inflicting summary justice upon the most hardened and presumptuous of the transgressors ; and in the case of David and the Gibeonites, the atonement consisted in the visiting upon Saul’s family of the wickedness of their father, — not as substitutes for him, that he might go free, but as his proper representatives, he being already dead. This was quite agreeable to the practice of those ages and countries ; and it was permitted, to represent the extirpation of evil in its derivations as well as in its original source. The spiritual lesson

* Ver. 46, 47, 48.

† Num. xxv. 7—12.

‡ 2 Sam. xxi. 1—9.

taught by both examples is, that, in order to the *making of atonement*, that is, the effecting of reconciliation, of agreement, and thus of conjunction, between man and the Lord, *the evils that occasion the separation must be renounced and removed*. No atonement can ever be effected (and it is a monstrous perversion of language so to apply the word) by the suffering, by one being, of the punishment due to the sins committed by another. To accomplish any real atonement, the sins themselves must be desisted from, put away, and exterminated from their place in the affections. Then, atonement is sure to be accomplished. Reconciliation cannot but ensue, when what occasioned the alienation exists no longer; and this must be removed *in and by the man himself*; it never can be the result of anything *only done for him in and by another*.

5. One other conclusive instance, proving that the word *atonement*, as used in the Scripture, and especially in the books of Moses, (where it occurs ten times oftener than in all the Bible beside), has no connection with the idea of vicarious suffering of punishment still remains. When the children of Israel destroyed the Midianites* and took possession of their property, a certain portion of the spoil was assigned, by command, to the Lord, under the name of tribute; over and above which, the men who had gone to war, and who had possessed themselves of numerous small articles of value, on ascertaining that they had all come safe back, not one being missing, presented a spontaneous offering from this part of the plunder also, to the amount of 16,750 shekels; and their words to Moses on making offering were these: "We have brought an oblation for the Lord, what every man hath gotten, of jewels of gold, chains and bracelets, rings, ear-rings and tablets, *to make an atonement for our souls before the Lord.*"† This offering was very similar that of the half-shekel per head, already noticed on numbering the people, which was also given "to make an atonement for their souls;" only *that* was given by command, *this* was a spontaneous effusion of gratitude on adverting to the wonderful preservation which they had experienced. Having discovered that not one of them had been killed or disabled in the war, they were forcibly struck with so extraordinary an instance of divine protection: and to acknowledge, practically, that they owed their lives, or their souls, (which term in Scripture is often used to signify lives), to the Divine Goodness, and from a feeling that, should they omit to ascribe their preservation to the Lord, they could not expect a continuance of this marked protection, they brought this spontaneous oblation for the Lord, *to make an atonement for their souls before him*.

* Num. xxxi.

† Ver. 50.

Here then, again, there was nothing vicarious, or in the way of the substitution of one party for another. They made an atonement for *their own* souls or lives: that is, they maintained their happy state of reconciliation or agreement with the Lord, by a practical and substantial acknowledgment that they owed their lives to his bounty: which is a striking representation of the gratitude that will be felt, and the acknowledgment that will be made, by the regenerating subject of the Lord's true Church, on emerging from the conflicts of temptation, — that he owes the preservation of his spiritual life, and all the increase of spiritual gifts which are obtained through victory in his trials, to the pure mercy, goodness, power, and protection of the Lord.

We have now, I believe, examined all the various modes of making atonement mentioned in the Old Testament: — in the New, the word, as we have seen, occurs only once, which is where Paul says to the Romans, that by Jesus Christ — meaning the Lord in his Humanity, — “we have received the atonement.” We find from our examination, that atonement was made, in the whole, in seven different ways — first, by the payment of the half-shekel per head on numbering the people: secondly, by prayer or intercession, as was done by Moses: thirdly, by Aaron's running with a pot of incense, kindled with fire from the altar, into the midst of the dying people: fourthly, by the putting to death of the principal perpetrators of great crimes, whose wickedness, while connived at, brought judgments down upon the people: fifthly, by making spontaneous offerings of the spoils gained in war: sixthly, as explained in the preceding PART of this SECTION, by presenting the scape-goat before the Lord, and then letting him go for a scape-goat into the wilderness; and seventhly, as also there explained, by the offering of sacrifices; which, as we now find, was only one mode of atonement out of seven.

Surely it must be impossible for any considerate mind to advert to all these *various modes* of making atonement, and yet to suppose that the true meaning of *atonement* is, the undergoing, by one person or being, of the punishment due to the sins of another. In most instances, likewise, or in most modes of making atonement (and virtually in all), the atonement was made *by the party for himself*, — not by another for him. Even in the case of the atonement by sacrifice, it was not anything done or suffered by the animal, in place of the offerer, that constituted the atonement; it was *his* offering up the animal as the expression of a principle and state of good existing in his own breast, by communication from the Lord, which caused it to be accepted as an atonement for him. Nor are even the cases

1. **Washers.** In some
 cases, as the Evans
 2. 1. **Washers.** In some
 3. 1. **Washers.** In some
 4. 1. **Washers.** In some
 5. 1. **Washers.** In some
 6. 1. **Washers.** In some
 7. 1. **Washers.** In some
 8. 1. **Washers.** In some
 9. 1. **Washers.** In some
 10. 1. **Washers.** In some
 11. 1. **Washers.** In some
 12. 1. **Washers.** In some
 13. 1. **Washers.** In some
 14. 1. **Washers.** In some
 15. 1. **Washers.** In some
 16. 1. **Washers.** In some
 17. 1. **Washers.** In some
 18. 1. **Washers.** In some
 19. 1. **Washers.** In some
 20. 1. **Washers.** In some
 21. 1. **Washers.** In some
 22. 1. **Washers.** In some
 23. 1. **Washers.** In some
 24. 1. **Washers.** In some
 25. 1. **Washers.** In some
 26. 1. **Washers.** In some
 27. 1. **Washers.** In some
 28. 1. **Washers.** In some
 29. 1. **Washers.** In some
 30. 1. **Washers.** In some
 31. 1. **Washers.** In some
 32. 1. **Washers.** In some
 33. 1. **Washers.** In some
 34. 1. **Washers.** In some
 35. 1. **Washers.** In some
 36. 1. **Washers.** In some
 37. 1. **Washers.** In some
 38. 1. **Washers.** In some
 39. 1. **Washers.** In some
 40. 1. **Washers.** In some
 41. 1. **Washers.** In some
 42. 1. **Washers.** In some
 43. 1. **Washers.** In some
 44. 1. **Washers.** In some
 45. 1. **Washers.** In some
 46. 1. **Washers.** In some
 47. 1. **Washers.** In some
 48. 1. **Washers.** In some
 49. 1. **Washers.** In some
 50. 1. **Washers.** In some
 51. 1. **Washers.** In some
 52. 1. **Washers.** In some
 53. 1. **Washers.** In some
 54. 1. **Washers.** In some
 55. 1. **Washers.** In some
 56. 1. **Washers.** In some
 57. 1. **Washers.** In some
 58. 1. **Washers.** In some
 59. 1. **Washers.** In some
 60. 1. **Washers.** In some
 61. 1. **Washers.** In some
 62. 1. **Washers.** In some
 63. 1. **Washers.** In some
 64. 1. **Washers.** In some
 65. 1. **Washers.** In some
 66. 1. **Washers.** In some
 67. 1. **Washers.** In some
 68. 1. **Washers.** In some
 69. 1. **Washers.** In some
 70. 1. **Washers.** In some
 71. 1. **Washers.** In some
 72. 1. **Washers.** In some
 73. 1. **Washers.** In some
 74. 1. **Washers.** In some
 75. 1. **Washers.** In some
 76. 1. **Washers.** In some
 77. 1. **Washers.** In some
 78. 1. **Washers.** In some
 79. 1. **Washers.** In some
 80. 1. **Washers.** In some
 81. 1. **Washers.** In some
 82. 1. **Washers.** In some
 83. 1. **Washers.** In some
 84. 1. **Washers.** In some
 85. 1. **Washers.** In some
 86. 1. **Washers.** In some
 87. 1. **Washers.** In some
 88. 1. **Washers.** In some
 89. 1. **Washers.** In some
 90. 1. **Washers.** In some
 91. 1. **Washers.** In some
 92. 1. **Washers.** In some
 93. 1. **Washers.** In some
 94. 1. **Washers.** In some
 95. 1. **Washers.** In some
 96. 1. **Washers.** In some
 97. 1. **Washers.** In some
 98. 1. **Washers.** In some
 99. 1. **Washers.** In some
 100. 1. **Washers.** In some

conniving at and cherishing them, they would bring upon him. He must confess from the heart, on emerging from spiritual trials, that it was by the Lord's power that he was brought through them in safety, and that all the acquisition of goods and graces which, in consequence, enrich his soul, are of the Lord's pure bounty; as expressed by the offerings of a valuable spoil made by the Israelites on their all returning safe from the war against Midian. He must reject his evils to hell, from whence they come, acknowledging that *that* is their home, and that they must be separated from him, that hell may not become *his* final home also; as represented by the sending of the scape-goat, representatively loaded with sins, into the wilderness. And he must worship the Lord from the affections of innocence and charity represented by the various animals offered in sacrifice. All these are things which, it is perfectly plain, man himself must do; though, as he will most heartily and gratefully acknowledge, by power given to him by the Lord; and sincerely doing them, they will be accepted *to make atonement for him*. But all this would have been impossible, had not the Lord effected a general atonement for all, by uniting Humanity with Divinity in his own Person, and thus putting man in a condition to receive those saving aids and graces, of which his Divine Humanity is the only Source.

SECTION VIII.

THE ATONEMENT, SACRIFICE, AND MEDIATION, OF JESUS CHRIST.

PART III.

The Mediation of Jesus Christ.

The Mediation of the Lord Jesus Christ is, unquestionably, a doctrine of the Scriptures, directly asserted in plain terms, and referred to, or assumed as true, by many other less express declarations of the Lord himself and his Apostles. Nevertheless, it must be acknowledged that this doctrine, as commonly held and maintained, is one of those which create, in many minds, a great prejudice against the Christian Religion, and which promote, or confirm them, in their denial of the Scriptures as a Revelation from God. It is affirmed by Deists, that

the doctrine of the Mediation of Jesus Christ, supposes, in the first place, that the Essential Nature of God is something very different from love, since, if God truly were love, he could not require the intervention of another to induce him to show mercy towards his creatures: and still less could he require the presence of such a Mediator continually, continually to keep him in forgiving disposition to which he had been brought, and to remind him (as if Omniscience could forget) of the wants of his creatures, and their need of his pity and compassion. They also contend, that it supposes the actual existence of two Divine Beings: for to affirm, they say, that the various Persons of the Trinity make and are but one God, bears contradiction on the face of it, when One is described as entreating the mercy of the other for the human race, and the other grants his mercy in compliance with such entreaty. Besides, they allege, it is a further absurdity to call these two *equal* Persons: when the power of giving or withholding what is solicited abides with one of them alone, and the other only obtains the benefits which he desires for the objects of his kind solicitude, by continual and urgent entreaty.

It is with pain, my candid and reflecting brethren, that I remind you of these objections, which the enemies of the Christian religion make to the doctrine of the Mediation of Jesus Christ: and it is with more pain that I add, that all which they allege respecting it is but too well-founded, as it regards the doctrine as generally taught. I have looked over many of the modern expositors of Scripture, in hopes that I should find in some of them a view of the subject which would not be liable to such objections: but I have looked in vain. All that I have consulted represent the matter precisely as it is represented in the statement I have just given as the objections of the Deist: all decidedly regard the Mediation of Jesus Christ as the interference of One Divine Person with another in the way of request and entreaty. And some greatly exult in, and dwell largely on the circumstances of, such a mode of mediation. The more reluctant they can represent the One Person to be persuaded, and the more urgent and even servile the other in persuading him, the greater honor they think they do to both. They describe the Mediator as pleading his merits, and even displaying before the eyes of the Father his yet open wounds, to move him to have mercy. Consider the subject seriously, ye Candid and Reflecting! The mediation of Jesus Christ, is, most unquestionably, a genuine Scripture doctrine: but is it not truly lamentable, that it should be so set forth in the doctrines received as those of the Christian Religion, to be made actually monstrous in the eye of Reason, and to give such

specious "occasion to the enemies of God to blaspheme?" Ought not every one who is concerned for the honor of God, and for the vindication of his Word, and of the Christian Religion as founded upon his Word, eagerly to accept a view of the subject, if one can be presented, which upholds the doctrine of Mediation as actually true in itself, but removes this gross and degrading mode of considering it? which accepts what is truly given respecting it in Scripture, evinces this to be in full harmony with all the genuine perceptions of Reason, and proves it to be completely consistent with the pure and unmixed goodness of Deity, with the Supreme Divinity of Jesus Christ, and with the Absolute Unity of the Divine Person and Essence? I do not, however, desire, to carry you away by your feelings or your wishes. Look candidly, and cautiously, if you please, at the view of it which we accept as part of the doctrines of Faith and Life to be held by the New Church signified by the New Jerusalem: consider the nature of the Scripture style and phraseology; weigh the testimony of Scripture, and examine the explanations of it, as we offer them to you: and then decide, either for the view of the doctrine of Mediation which divides the Divine Being into two completely separate Persons, of opposite natures, or for that which requires to support it only One God, and he a God of love, in One Divine Person. According to the view which has been largely supported in the preceding SECTION, it was the One Jehovah who assumed Humanity in the Person of Jesus Christ; and the Humanity thus assumed is what is properly called in Scripture the Son of God. When, as we have seen, the angel announced to Mary his approaching birth, he said, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that Holy Thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." Most certainly, it was not the essential Divine Nature of the Lord that was born of the Virgin Mary, but only the Human Nature: but that which was to be born of her was to be called the Son of God: this title then is properly, as we have fully evinced, the name of the Lord's Human Nature. This Human Nature it was, as we have seen in the FIRST PART of this SECTION, which became, or was made, a sacrifice to God; the meaning of that phrase being, a thing devoted, consecrated, and hallowed to God. This, we have fully ascertained, was the case with the Lord's Human Nature, when it was completely glorified, or sanctified, or so assimilated to the Nature of the Divine Essence itself, as to form completely one Person therewith, comprehending the whole of it in itself as the body comprehends the soul, being made the full and adequate Organ for its opera-

tions upon human minds, adapting those operations to the state in which the human mind now stands, so as to render them far more efficacious in restoring degenerate man to his proper order, than could be the case with the operation of the pure Divinity unclothed and unmodified by a Glorified Humanity ; just as the body of man is the full and adequate organ for the operations of his soul, adapting those operations so as to produce effects upon the objects of this natural world around it, in a manner which it would be impossible for his soul alone to accomplish, unclothed with the body.

As man was created in the image and likeness of God, and thus has a trinity in himself of soul, body, and their operative energy, formed after the image of the Trinity in his Creator of Divinity, Humanity, and *their* Operative Energy, so may we discern in man, likewise, an image of the mediation of Jesus Christ. Man's body operates as a medium, by which his soul acts upon persons and things around him ; and by which, again, impressions from these are conveyed to his soul : thus, man's body is, in both respects, the medium of communication between his soul and things around it. Just so, the Glorified Humanity of Jesus Christ is the medium by which the Divine Essence acts upon man, and by which, again, man has access even to the Inmost Divine Essence. In both respects, then, — as conveying the gifts of salvation from God to man, and as affording to man access to God, — the Glorified Humanity of Jesus Christ is the medium of communication. The analogy is most perfect and complete. As man's soul, without his body, cannot communicate with the world ; and objects in the world could not make their state, their presence, nor even their existence, known to his soul, — the body being a medium expressly formed for communication with the world, and given to the soul for that purpose ; so, when man had sunk into the natural state in which he now exists, the pure and unclothed Deity could no longer operate upon him in a saving manner, and he could have no access, no adequate communication with, the Author of his existence. Therefore Jehovah, out of his infinite love to mankind, clothed himself with Human Nature ; and having glorified that Human Nature by wonderful divine means, so as to make it the express image, and adequate instrument of action, of his Essential Divinity, he has provided an eternal Medium of communication between himself and his creatures. *The operation, then, of this Glorified Human Form, which has become the Investiture, and, as it were, the very Body, of the Godhead, in affording to man the means of approaching to God, and in conveying the gifts of salvation, — the communications of the Holy Spirit, from God to man, is what is*

meant by the Scripture doctrine of the Mediation of Jesus Christ.

This is a view of the subject which entirely clears the doctrine of the Mediation of Jesus Christ from the inconsistencies generally attached to it, makes it perfectly unexceptionable in the eye of Reason, completely takes away the objections alleged against it by the Infidel, and removes the ground of his rejection of the Scriptures on that account. Instead of militating against the glorious and blessed truth, that God, in his essential nature, is love, this view of the Mediation of Jesus Christ supposes and establishes that truth; as it was nothing but the Infinite Love of the Lord that led to the assumption by him of the Human Essence, to afford a medium for restoring the communication between his creatures and himself. Instead of militating against the Absolute Unity of the Deity, this view of Mediation supposes and confirms it; as it does not regard the Mediator as a Separate Person from the Godhead, but as his proper Person itself, being a Glorified Form brought forth from himself, and put on, as a Medium of manifesting himself to man. And instead of militating against the Supreme Divinity of Jesus Christ, it assumes that he, as to his Divine Nature, is Jehovah from eternity, and, as to his Divine and Human Natures in union, is the Only God of heaven and earth.

All the general truths, then, of the Word of God as well as all the suffrages of Reason, concur in supporting this view of the nature of the Mediation of the Lord Jesus Christ. If the Unity which the Scriptures assert for the Deity is to be preserved; if the Supreme Divinity of Jesus Christ is to be maintained; if the first attribute and essential of the Godhead is to be allowed to be Love:—then this must be the true view of the nature of the Mediation of the Lord Jesus Christ. Every other way of proposing it violates these great truths,—the first truths of all religion,—the first truths of the Revelation of God: If then these *are* truths, every other way of understanding this sublime subject must be erroneous.

But, independently of this inferential conclusion, what is the direct testimony of the Bible upon this subject?

The passages of the Bible in which the term “Mediator” is made use of, are but five in the whole;—all in the Epistles of Paul. In one of these, the Mediator referred to is Moses: in three others, Jesus Christ is spoken of as the Mediator of the New Covenant, in the same sense as Moses was the Mediator of the Old: and in the remaining one, he is called the “Mediator between God and man,” in a way that leads directly to the proper nature of the Doctrine of Mediation.

The word *Mediator*, being pure Latin, does not convey, to the person who is acquainted with no language but the English, an idea of its original meaning. It is commonly understood, therefore, only, in its secondary sense, as one who acts as a conciliator, or reconciler, between two other parties, bringing them to a state of agreement. This meaning does undoubtedly belong to the word, as it is used in the Scriptures and elsewhere, and is properly included in the doctrine of the Mediation of Jesus Christ: yet it does not suggest the primary and grammatical meaning of the term. The word *Mediator* is formed from the word *medium* which signifies *the middle between two extremes*. A Mediator, therefore, is *one who stands in the middle*, — who goes between two opposite parties, and acts as a medium by which they are brought into communication and thus into agreement, and are kept from coming into hostile collision. The etymology, and thus the grammatical meaning, of the Greek word used in the New Testament, answers exactly to that of the Latin word, *Mediator*, by which we translate it.

According then, to this grammatical meaning of the word *Mediator*, we have the exact idea which we have shown to belong to the doctrine of the Mediation of Jesus Christ. His Glorified Humanity is properly a Medium between the incomprehensible Divine Essence and the finite and now corrupt nature of man; and supplies the means by which communication between them can be opened, and reconciliation can be effected.

But, in a less strict sense, a Mediator, in the language of the New Testament, signifies, *one who brings a communication from God to man*, and is made the instrument for establishing a dispensation. Thus in the Epistle to the Galatians,* Moses is called the Mediator of the law, which he delivered to the Israelites: of which the Apostle there says, that it was “ordained by angels by the hand of a *Mediator* :” to which he adds, “Now a Mediator is not a mediator of one: but God is one.” Here he speaks of the law as being given from God to Moses by the ministry of angels, and as being delivered by Moses to the people: who thus coming, and *that* only secondarily, between the people and God, and being the instrument of delivering to them what otherwise they could not have received, is denominated a *Mediator*. Just in the same manner, the same Apostle thrice applies the name of *Mediator* to Jesus, in the Epistle to the Hebrews. After speaking of the typical priesthood and service of the tabernacle established by Moses, he says of Jesus, But now hath he obtained a more excellent

* Ch. iii. 19, 20.

ministry, by how much also he is *the Mediator of a better covenant*, established upon better promises :”* where, by “*the Mediator of a better covenant*,” he obviously means, the *medium of establishing and dispensing such a covenant*. In the same manner, he says, in the next chapter, “And for this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament ; that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance :”† meaning still, that he was *the medium of dispensing the new testament or covenant*. He uses the same phrase again, in chap. xii., when telling the Hebrew converts of the privileges they enjoyed by becoming Christians ; among which he states, that they are “come to Jesus *the Mediator of the new covenant*.” In these passages, the Apostle evidently means precisely the same thing as he expresses in quite different terms at the commencement of the Epistle ; when he begins thus : “God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days *spoken unto us by his Son*, whom he hath appointed heir of all things ; by whom also he made the worlds.”

These passages, then, speak of Jesus as being the Medium of conveying to man the blessings of the gospel-dispensation ; but do not offer anything very explicit as to his work of mediation in general. This however is done in the only remaining passage in which Jesus is called a Mediator : This is in the first Epistle to Timothy. The Apostle, after directing prayers to be made for all men, and assigning as a reason, that “it is the will of God that all men should be saved, and should come to the knowledge of the truth,” adds this remarkable statement ; showing, both in what manner the Lord Jesus is a Mediator, and that the benefits of his mediation extend to all mankind. “For (says he) there is one God, and *one Mediator between God and man, the man, Christ Jesus*.”‡ Most remarkable is the accurate discrimination of the language which the Apostle here uses, — “*the man, Christ Jesus*.” In no other place throughout his writings does he employ the same phrase. He indeed often transposes the order of the Lord’s names, and calls him “Christ Jesus,” instead of “Jesus Christ,” without, as far as I have been able to observe, any intended difference of idea : but never does he elsewhere speak of “*the man, Christ Jesus*.” What does he mean by it here ? Does he intend to teach us that Christ Jesus is merely a man : which is an argument the Unitarians endeavor to draw from these words ? Never was an argument founded on a more unsubstantial basis ;

* Ch. viii. 6.

† Ch. ix. 15.

‡ Ch. ii. 5.

since the Apostle abundantly shows, throughout his writings, that he knew the Lord Jesus to be a very different being from a mere man. Indeed, he positively declares that Jesus Christ is not a man, when he says to the Galatians,* that he “received *not* the gospel” which he preached “of *man*, but by the revelation of *Jesus Christ* :” which would be a contradiction in terms if he supposed *Jesus Christ* to be a *man*. Very different conceptions must he have had of him than as being merely a man, when he says, in the passage I just quoted from the beginning of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that “God hath in these last days spoken to us by his Son, *by whom he made the worlds* ;” and when he adds, “Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person ;” — where, as noticed above, the word used in the original does not signify *Person*, but *Substance*, or *Essence* ; so that the declaration actually affirms the Son to be the Manifested Form of the Incomprehensible Divine Essence : being precisely the doctrine which I am endeavoring to recommend on this glorious subject.

As then Paul so well knew that the Lord Jesus Christ was not a mere man, how came he to call him a man here — “the *man*, Christ Jesus ?” Might he not as well have said, simply, “there is one Mediator between God and man, even Christ Jesus, or Jesus Christ ?” If he had he would not have conveyed so precisely the truth he intended. Those to whom he wrote well knew that Jesus is God as well as man, — that he has a Divine Nature as well as a human : had, then, the Apostle expressed himself in this general manner, it might have been supposed, that he was the Mediator *as to both natures*, — that, both as to his Divinity and his Humanity, he acted as Mediator between God and man. This would have been false ; to guard against it, therefore, the Apostle carefully limits the Lord’s Mediatorship to his Humanity alone, by using the accurately descriptive phrase, “*the man*, Christ Jesus.” This completely excludes his purely Divine Nature from any concern in this function of Mediation, and most justly and accurately limits it to his Humanity only. After we have shown so fully, in the preceding Section, that the Son is not a separate Person from the Father, but is his Glorious Human Form or Person ; it can scarcely be necessary to offer any considerations to evince, that the Mediator, in like manner, is not a person subsisting separately from the God with whom he mediates. But if direct proof of this were required, the Apostle here supplies it. We have seen that by calling the Mediator, “the man, Christ Jesus,” he limits the function of Mediation of his Humanity, and excludes from it his Divinity. But is the Lord Jesus Christ

* Ch. i. 11, 12.

himself, then, divided into two persons? Does his Divine Nature constitute a person by itself, and his Human Nature a person by itself? Such must actually be the fact, if the Mediator spoken of here, is actually a separately subsisting person; for it is only the *Humanity*, — “the *man*, Christ Jesus,” that is *the Mediator*. The Mediator, then, cannot be a separately subsisting person, unless the Humanity of Jesus Christ is a person subsisting separately from his Divinity. No rational being will affirm such an absurdity: although there have been doctrines broached in the world, and some now subsisting, which make very near approaches to it.* But I need not appeal to any rational person, to ask whether Jesus Christ can be imagined to be actually two persons. If not, since it is his Glorified Humanity alone which is the Mediator, the Mediator is obviously not to be conceived of as a separately subsisting Person.

It is common in Scripture to personify *principles*, and speak of them as if they were *persons*, without its being intended that they actually are so; because, otherwise, the Scripture simplicity of style could not be preserved, but there would be continual need of abstract terms and metaphysical definitions. Thus in all that the Lord Jesus Christ said to his disciples respecting himself, his Father, and the Holy Spirit, he expressly declares that he spake in proverbs. “These things have I spoken unto you in Proverbs: but the time cometh when I shall no longer speak unto you in proverbs, but I shall show you plainly of the Father.”† By proverbs he means the same as are elsewhere called parables: and it is peculiarly the character of the parabolic form of speech to deal in personifications. As we are not to conceive of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as separately existing persons; so neither are we to conceive of the Mediator, who is the Son, as a separately existing person. The Mediator is the Glorified Humanity of Jesus Christ; so called as being the Medium by which man has access to God, and by which divine graces and blessings are dispensed from God to man.

I will illustrate this view of the subject a little further, by quoting a few texts, which, without containing the word “Mediator,” or “Mediation,” refer to the Lord’s Glorified Humanity as being such a Medium of communication between man and his Maker.

That it is by the Lord’s Glorified Humanity that man has access to the Divinity, the Apostle Paul strikingly declares in the Epistle to the Hebrews. He says, “Having, therefore, brethren, boldness [which ought to be *liberty*] to enter into the

* See the next Section, Part III.

† John xvi. 25.

holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, his flesh : — let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith.”* By the flesh of Jesus the Apostle evidently means his Human Nature, and by it, he says, we have access to the holy of holies, meaning, to the Inmost of Deity.

Jesus Christ while on earth, when he speaks of himself as distinct from his Father, means, by that mode of phraseology, to speak of his Humanity as distinct from the Divine Essence. Now he says, “No man cometh unto the Father but by me ;”† a clear declaration, that only in and by his Glorious Person is communication to be had with the Essential Divinity. When this is joined, as it is in the sacred narrative, with what he immediately afterwards said to Philip, remarked upon in the last Section, the evidence of the truth becomes irresistible. It is impossible to affirm more strongly, that the person of Jesus, or his Glorified Humanity, is the only Medium of communication between man and the Divine Essence, — the only vehicle, so to speak, in and by which the pure Divinity can be seen or comprehended. Similar is the statement of the Evangelist John himself: “No man hath seen God at any time : the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father he hath *declared him* ;” where the word in the original means, as already noticed, “*hath manifested him*,” or “*brought him forth to view*.” Thus, as the Lord Jesus Christ is the Divine Form which gives man access to God, so is he represented as being also the Medium which reveals the Godhead, and all things belonging to it, to man. “All things,” saith he in Matthew, “are delivered unto me of my Father, and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father ; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whom *the Son will reveal him*.”‡ So, in other passages, he is represented as receiving in himself all things belonging to the Father, and then, as the only Medium of communication between man and the Father, dispensing them to mankind. “As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father ; even so he that eateth me shall live *by me*.”§ — “When the comforter is come, whom I will send unto you *from the Father*, even the Spirit of Truth which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me.”|| “He shall glorify me ; for he shall *receive of mine and show it unto you*. All things that the Father hath *are mine* : therefore said I, he shall receive of *mine*, and shall *show it unto you*.”¶

Many similar declarations might be adduced ; but these may suffice for our present purpose. They abundantly represent

* Ch. ix. 19.

† John xiv. 6.

‡ Ch. xi. 27.

§ John vi. 57.

|| Ch. xv. 26.

¶ Ch. xvi. 14, 15.

the true nature of the Mediation of Jesus Christ, and show that it consists in his Glorified humanity's acting as a Medium, by which access is afforded to man from God, and divine benefits, — even the gifts of salvation, which are the communications of the Holy Spirit, are conveyed from God to man.

The reader, I am sure, will be gratified by seeing the above idea beautifully illustrated by Dr. Watts, "The sun in the natural world," he observes, "is a bright emblem of Divinity, or the Godhead; for it is the spring of all light and heat and life to the creation. — Now if we should suppose this vast globe of fire, which we call the sun, to be inclosed in a huge hollow sphere of crystal, which should attemper its rays like a transparent veil, and give milder and gentler influences to the burning beams of heat, and yet transmit every desirable or useful portion of light or heat; this would be a happy emblem of *the Man, Christ Jesus, in whom dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily*. Is the Lamb of God, who, in a milder and gracious manner, conveys the blessings originally derived from God, his Father, to all the saints. We partake of them in our measures in this lower world, among his churches here on earth; but it is with a nobler influence, and in a more sublime degree, the blessings of paradise are diffused through all the mansions of glory, by this illustrious medium of conveyance, Jesus the Son of God."* This emblem is as just as it is striking, provided we guard against one or two misapprehensions which may arise from it. Though the Son of God, or the Divine Humanity, is the medium of conveying all blessings to men and angels, we are not to regard it as a mere passive conveyance, but an infinitely active one. He says, "As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself:"† thus the Divine Energies or Holy Spirit are not simply transmitted from the Divine Essence through the Humanity, but are first received by the Humanity, and thence, by its own life and activity derived from its perfect union with the Divine Essence, dispensed to mankind; precisely as is expressed in the words quoted above, "whom *I* will send unto you *from* the Father." Secondly: although it is true that the rays of Godhead are "attempered" by the Humanity, they are not thereby weakened or blunted; but on the contrary, are rendered, as to their influence on man, far more penetrating and powerful; so that Watt's crystal sphere must be considered as operating, with respect to man, in the manner of a magnifying lens. Thus the prophet, in regard to the effect on man of the assumption of humanity by Jehovah, uses these strong figures: "In that day, the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and

* Works, vol. vii. p. 148.

† John v. 26.

the light of the sun shall be seven fold, as the light of seven days; in the day that the Lord bindeth up the breach of his people, and healeth the stroke of her wound."^{*} Be it also observed, that if the sun inclosed in a crystal sphere, is, as suggested by Watts, a just emblem of the Father and Son of the Scriptures, we see how impossible it is to regard them as two persons; we see that their relation is precisely that of the soul and the body; and we see how idle it must be to seek for God, anywhere but in the Person of Jesus Christ: to which conviction Dr. Watts himself is reputed to have arrived before he died.

This is the way, also, in which the Lord Jesus Christ makes intercession for man: not by intreating a wrathful God to look on him with pity, but by affording the requisite Medium by which a defiled creature, like man, can approach the holiness of an infinite God, without perishing in the attempt, as a piece of earthly substance would do on approaching immediately to the sun. Can they who believe in intercession by intreaty, pretend to deny, that in heart they believe in *at least* two Gods, and those, also, of opposite natures? For how can the God who supplicates and intreats, be the same God as he who is supplicated and intreated? How can the nature of the God, who, without any feast on another's sufferings to appease his offended justice, intreats and supplicates another God to lay aside his wrath, be the same as that of him who only lays aside his wrath in compliance with such intreaty and supplication? Nay, how can the God who cannot raise man to heaven of his own free motion, but must first obtain his forgiveness of another God by prayer and supplication, be any God at all? Does not the supposition fully imply, that the Father and Son are as completely two Gods as any two human beings are two men, and that they differ as much from each other as a subject from an absolute sovereign? All this fiction, also, respecting the Lord's mediating and interceding for man by praying to the Father, has been invented in direct contradiction to his own assurance: "I say NOT unto you," he declares "*that I will pray the Father for you: for the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God.*"[†] It is in vain to offer to put this proof aside, as has been attempted, by referring to the instances, in John xvii., of the Lord's praying for his disciples: for does it follow, because the Lord prayed for his disciples *before* his complete glorification, that he prays for them *now*? Before his glorification he prayed for himself; does he pray for himself *now*? As has been proved in the preceding SECTION,^{*} since his glorification,

* Isa. xxx. 26.

† John xvi. 26, 27.

‡ P, 392.

or perfect union with the Father, he does not pray to, or address in any way, the Father at all, being the One Person with him. It is in reference to the completion of this union that he here says, "I will not pray the Father for you: for the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God." To believe that the Lord *came out from God*, is, as we have seen in the last SECTION,* to believe that his Humanity is an immediate evolution from his Divine Essence — an actual manifestation of what was always potentially included in the Divinity, ready to be put forth, for the salvation of man, when the fullness of state and time should have arrived. When this is acknowledged, the Father himself is said to love us, because the love which constitutes his essence is then capable of being communicated to us and received by us. Hence again we see that the Lord's Humanity is the Medium by which we gain access to his Divinity, and are brought into communication with it; just as by the medium of a man's body we gain access to, and have communication with, his soul. The Lord teaches the same truth in the most direct form when he says, "I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture."† What is the door but the medium of access? And that, to obtain such access, we are to address the naked Divinity immediately, but the Lord Jesus Christ as the Divine Person of the Father, he again teaches when he says, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber."‡

Consider the subject seriously, ye Candid and Reflecting! and examine whether this is not the only view of the Mediation of Jesus Christ which harmonizes with all the great truths of Scripture and reason, and, without taking any thing away from what is really taught in the Scriptures, renders the subject invulnerable to any deistical objections. Jehovah assumed Humanity to make himself accessible to his fallen creatures. We are to avail ourselves of the Medium thus divinely appointed, and approach him therein. "Let us enter into the holiest by the new and living way which he hath *consecrated* for us through the veil, that is to say, *his flesh*." Let us accept with thankfulness the saving blessings which his *Glorified Humanity* is the only Medium of conveying to man's soul.

In conclusion: May not these views of the New Church on the Atonement and Mediation of Jesus Christ be confidently recommended to the consideration of the Candid and Reflect-

* Pp. 425, 426.

† John x. 9.

‡ Ver. 1.

ing? Do they not unfold the true doctrine of the Scriptures on these momentous subjects, in a manner which is calculated to recommend the Scriptures themselves to the more cordial acceptance of men of reason and reflection? Do they not satisfactorily clear the Christian Religion from the imputation of sanctioning doctrines at which all reason and common sense revolt, by showing that the sentiments on those subjects which bear that character are not those of the true Christian Religion, but are the mere fallacious conclusions of gross minds, that have looked at the Scriptures in a merely superficial manner? Do they not evince, that the genuine doctrines of Scripture are here co-incident with the views of sound reason and true philosophy? Ought not then the writings of the enlightened Instrument by whom these doctrines are deduced from the Scriptures, to be favorably regarded by all those to whom true philosophy, sound reason, and scriptural theology, are objects of esteem?

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.

SECTION IX.

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.

PART I.

The New Church Doctrine of Life, a Doctrine of Genuine Holiness.

I AM now finally to appeal to you, my Candid and Reflecting Readers, on the subject of the Christian Life ; and I trust I shall not find it difficult to convince you, that when our doctrines affirm, that a life of righteousness, but not of Pharisaic righteousness, is the life that leads to heaven, they affirm the pure doctrine of the Scriptures, and maintain it as a doctrine of genuine holiness.

Among the accusations which have been brought against the doctrines of the New Church, there is none which will appear more extraordinary to future ages, none which at present appears more supprising to those who know what they are, than the monstrous charge of their being opposed to true holiness of life : Yet the writer whom I chiefly follow has thought proper to affirm, that the enlightened man who was made the instrument of deducing those doctrines from the Scriptures, comes under the condemnation of the Lord's words, when he says, "Whosoever shall break one of the least of these commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven." Other assailants, almost without number, have endeavored to deter the public from examining the writings of Swedenborg for themselves by similar unfounded aspersions. Without offering any thing but gross misrepresentations to support his imputations, the writer I follow goes on, through two or three pages,* moralizing on the "awful responsibility" lying on the writer, the translators, and circulators, of "false doctrines and loose principles;" as if such guilt were incurred by the writer, translators, and circulators, of the doc-

* Pp. 4—7.

trines and principles of the New Church ! Yet why should any extent of calumny surprise us ? when truth has always received the same treatment on its first promulgation, and before its doctrines were so generally known, as to make evident to all the falsehood of such accusations. The writings of the early Christian apologists are filled with accounts of the monstrous fictions which were invented to blacken the then new religion and those who received it. All the most celebrated Reformers, at the era of the separation from Rome, were represented as monsters of impiety : an imputation, certainly, which was grossly scandalous and unfounded, though I would by no means represent those upon whom it was cast as maintainers of genuine truth. No more could I affirm this of the original Methodists : but this is no reason for representing their excesses as worse than they were : yet their severe antagonist, Bishop Lavington, concludes his celebrated work entitled *The Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists Compared*, with a delineation of the abominations which were practised at the Eleusinian mysteries, and intimates his conviction, that the private meetings of the Methodists (and he quotes passages from their writings as countenancing the charge) were not more innocent. But why advert to inferior instances to evince how naturally both genuine and comparative truth, even to the mere zeal for what is believed to be the truth, are maligned and misrepresented on their first appearance ? Do the opponents of the doctrines of the New Church strain them to a sense which does not belong to them ? the Lord Himself, by his representative, David, complains that his divine sentiments were similarly perverted : “ False witnesses did rise up : they laid to my charge things that I knew not : ” “ Every day they wrest my words. ” * Do they affirm of the doctrines of the New Church, which are formed from the pure truths of the Word of God, that they teach men to break the divine commandments ? The disciple is not above his Master ; and the teachers of the professing church said of the Word of God himself, when Incarnate among them, “ We know that this man is a sinner. ” †

The whole of the verse of which a part is so calumniously applied to the illustrious Swedenborg, with the verse which follows it, delivers, in the most explicit manner, the Lord's doctrine respecting the species of righteousness which was to distinguish his disciples : “ Whosoever, ” he declares, “ shall break one of these least commandments, shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven ; but whosoever shall do and teach them shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. For I say unto you, Except your righteousness shall exceed

* Ps. xxxv. 11 ; lvi. 5.

† John ix. 24.

the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter the kingdom of heaven."* It is here most decisively taught, that a life of righteousness, but not of Pharisaic righteousness, is the way to heaven, I propose then to show, that the doctrine thus advanced is to be understood in all the fullness of meaning which the Lord's words naturally convey; that to invent any interpretation of them which tends to evade their evident purport, — to break, or diminish the force of, any of the divine commandments, — is to incur the condemnation which they pronounce; and that the doctrine they teach, is, in all its integrity and purity, the doctrine of the New Church and of the writings of Swedenborg; which thus is a doctrine of genuine holiness.

By a life of righteousness, it will of course be understood, we mean a life of obedience to the Lord's commandments: and that such obedience is required of all those who call themselves his disciples, is so evident in Scripture, that scarcely any can be so bold as openly to deny it; though many break the force of the commandments respecting it, by straining their language to a different meaning. The whole of the Bible, both in the Old Testament and the New, is nothing else but the code of God's commandments, with an ample comment respecting the rewards which Divine Goodness bestows on those who keep them, and the punishments which unavoidably overtake those who persevere in disregarding them. Under the Jewish dispensation, the keeping of the commandments of God had rewards in this life attached to it, and the disobeying of them was followed by punishments in this life; and when such disobedience became national, it was to be followed with expulsion from their own country, and exile and captivity in foreign lands. Accordingly, when the Jews, having long refused, by obedience to the divine commandments, to render of the fruits of the vineyard to its rightful Lord, proceeded to the direful extent of casting the Divine Heir out of his own vineyard and slaying him, they were finally ejected from being tenants of the vineyard, or from being the recognised church of God in the world; and with it, agreeably to the nature of the punishments with which, under that dispensation, disobedience was attended, they were miserably destroyed by foreign invaders, were finally cast out of their own land, and have been abject wanderers in foreign countries ever since; exhibiting a standing monument before our eyes of the awful consequences of disobedience. But many modern teachers will here exclaim, "Yes! but the case is quite different now: they were under a covenant of works, but we are under the covenant of grace." True, I answer, from the

* Matt. v. 19, 20.

doctrines of the New Church : we *are* under the covenant of grace : but in what does this grace consist ? In the power which is bestowed upon man, in consequence of the increased divine aids and communications of the Spirit which are the blessed effects of the Incarnation of Jehovah in the person of Jesus Christ, whereby he is enabled to keep the divine commandments from that inward ground, in the spirit and not in the letter only, — in the heart and mind as well as in the outward form, — which is intended by the Author of those commandments, the God who looketh at the heart. We *are* under grace ! “ Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ ; ” and “ as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to as many as believe on his name. ” * Believing on his name, then, does not, of itself, make them sons of God, but brings the power of becoming such ; in other words, it is indispensably necessary to our receiving from God the power to keep his commandments in the spirit as well as in the letter : and “ he that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, ” saith the Lord Jesus Christ, “ he it is that loveth me, and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him : ” † which is only another mode of declaring, that such shall be the sons of God.

If we were to cite all the passages in the discourses of the Lord Jesus Christ in which he declares that the keeping of his commandments, in other words, a life of righteousness, is indispensable to admission into heaven, we must quote a great proportion of his instructions indeed, including the entire burthen of the whole. More, surely, cannot be necessary, to remind Christian readers of the constant tenor of his exhortations, than to repeat the sublime and pathetic conclusion of the longest of his discourses, his sermon on the mount. That whole discourse is a series of precepts, enjoining righteousness of life ; and he closes it with saying, “ Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him to a wise man which built his house upon a rock : and the rain descended and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house ; and it fell not ; because it was founded upon a rock. And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand : and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house ; and it fell : and great was the fall of it. ” ‡ So, how plainly are the conditions of admission to eternal happiness laid before us, in the parable of the sheep and the goats ! To the sheep, with words of the highest tenderness and affection, the Divine Judge enumerates a num-

* John i. 17, 12.

† Ch. xiv. 21.

‡ Matt. vii. 24 — 27.

ber of good works, as representative of a life of charity and goodness, which he says they had done, and done to him : and these are expressly denominated the righteous : to the goats, the same words are mentioned as having by them been entirely neglected : and the discourse concludes with saying, "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."* And the doctrine of the Epistles is precisely the same as that of the Gospels, though much mischievous industry has been employed to set them at variance ; and many theologians of high name have thought they have effected a glorious achievement, when they have made the Apostles appear to contradict their Divine Master, and when they have extolled the sentiments thus forced from their Epistles as the genuine gospel, and depreciated the opposite sentiments of Jesus Christ as not "evangelical."† Paul, however, plainly enough teaches, that it is righteousness of life which enables man to stand in the judgment, and to obtain admission into heaven. "God," he declares, "will render to every man according to his deeds : To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, — eternal life : But unto them that are contentious and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, — indignation and wrath : tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil ; — but glory, honor, and peace, to every man that worketh good."‡ So, the same apostle assures us, that to produce this life of obedience is the design of the grace of God : "The grace of God," saith he, "that bringeth salvation, hath appeared unto all men, teaching us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present evil world ; looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God, even our Saviour Jesus Christ ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."§ Here the apostle plainly tells us, that the grace of God, of which he elsewhere speaks so often, is given to enable us to live righteously ; that it is by living righteously, that we shall be prepared to stand before our Saviour and Judge ; and that the design of his coming into the world, whence we re-

* Matt. xxv. 34 — 46.

† See a Sermon of Nathan Taylor, an old divine, in the Methodist Magazine for July or August, 1828. Toplady, in his posthumous tracts, quotes the words of Paul in Acts xiii. 39, as the doctrine of the gospel, in opposition to the words of Jesus in Matt. v. 48, which he treats as the abrogated doctrine of the law. It would be easy to multiply examples.

‡ Rom. ii. 6 — 10.

§ Tit. ii. 11 — 14. That the above is the proper translation, see before, p. 876.

ceive such grace, also was, to enable us so to live, by being zealous of good works.

This, then, is the doctrine of the New Church respecting the way of admission into heaven : and this, we see, according to the Scriptures throughout, is the only way thither. A good life, or a life of righteousness, seriously commenced in this world, is the only life that can endure the sphere of heaven, and the presence of the Divine Judge. On this account, a life according to the Ten Commandments is one of the two essentials, to which the doctrines of the New Church reduce the whole of religion : the other is, the acknowledgment of the Lord. And these two are completely incapable of being separated in act, though they may be thought of separately in idea. For no one can live a life of obedience to the commandments, from an internal ground, as well as in outward form, from himself : it is only possible by and from the Lord, and by power communicated from him ; let none therefore suppose, that, when insisting upon a life of righteousness, we go about to establish our own righteousness. It being only possible by power communicated from the Lord, all the merit of it belongs, not to man, but to the Lord alone. And this power can be imparted to none but those who acknowledge the Lord, and look to him to impart it. In like manner, no one in heart acknowledge the Lord, but in proportion as he is grounded in the desire of obeying his commandments ; without which, whatever, he may say with the lips, he cherishes the denial of the Lord in his heart, whether he may be aware of it or not ; and the loudest profession of faith is but an empty sound. Faith and life invariably go together, and such as the one is, such is the other.

Such being the fact, and such the doctrine of the New Church on the absolute necessity of a life of righteousness, — most cordially does she accept the divine declaration which says, “ Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.” What is the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees here spoken of, and rejected, by the Lord ? Its character is abundantly delineated in other parts of the New Testament. It was the righteousness of those who formed the most strict professors of the church at that time existing in the world, but which was in a state of utter decline and corruption. It was a righteousness which was rigid in outward observances, especially in little matters, but which quite overlooked and disregarded the true end and design of the divine commandments, and, while it kept them in the letter, entirely omitted them in the spirit. It was a righteousness which did its works to be seen of men. It was a righteousness which made great pretensions

to more religion than others, and which announced its claims by its outward appearance and the form of its dress: for we read, of the Scribes and Pharisees, that they made broad their phylacteries, and enlarged the borders of their garments. It was a righteousness which in the language of the prophet, continually said in its heart, "Stand away, and come not near, for I am holier than thou;" and the professors of which, in the language of the gospel, "trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and despised others." It was a righteousness which made clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, while within they were full of extortion and excess. It was a righteousness which paid tithe of mint, and anise, and cummin, and omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith or fidelity. It was a righteousness which, not finding the precepts of the divine Word numerous and minute enough to give sufficient opportunity for its love of display and pretence, added many others to it, about which the divine law is silent and indifferent; such as the washing of cups and pots, brazen vessels and tables, and of the hands before meat. In short, it was a righteousness which affected the external man, only, and did not reach within; a righteousness which delighted more in performance of its own invention, than in any that the law of God enjoined; and which in the performance of the latter, even when it kept the moral law or that of the Ten Commandments, only kept it in external form, and merely as a civil and moral law, — thus from outward motives, such as only looked to well-being in this world, — without regarding it at the same time as a spiritual law, whose precepts are to form the law of the mind as well as the law of the body.

What, then, is the righteousness which the Lord alludes to, when he declares that it is a righteousness which must exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees? Does he mean that we must be still more scrupulous than they in matters purely indifferent? Does he mean that, whatever they do, we must go father in the same line? that as they make sad their faces that they may appear unto men to fast, we must make ours sadder? that as they so arrange the form of their garments as to announce their pretensions to holiness to all beholders, we must still more distinguish ourselves by the singularity of our appearance? Nothing, surely, nothing of the kind. He does not mean that we are to exceed them in that in which they are superabundant, but in that in which they are deficient; by keeping the divine commandments in our hearts as well as in our actions; by supplying to the observance the inward principle, without which the outward form is an idle mockery, a dead letter. This is evident from the comment which the Divine Speaker makes upon his own

text. The scribes and Pharisees thought that they sufficiently obeyed the commandment which says, "Thou shalt not kill," if they did not carry their enmities into the outward act of murder; the Divine Author and Expositor of the commandment declares, that he is guilty of a breach of it, and liable to divine judgment accordingly, "who is angry with his brother without cause." The Scribes and Pharisees thought that they sufficiently obeyed the commandment which says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," if they did not carry the concupiscence into the very act: "But I say unto you," says the Divine Author and Expositor of this commandment, "That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart."* And from these two instances, the Saviour plainly intimates the extent of all the other precepts of the Decalogue, and clearly shows in which direction the righteousness of his disciples must exceed that of those who acted in that day as the teachers of righteousness. He calls not upon us to be more sanctimonious than they were, but more sincere; not to shelter ourselves behind the mere letter of a precept, but to take in with it its whole spirit and design; and not to be content only to shun evils as they appear before the world, but so to shun them as to avoid them also in the sight of God.

This, then, is the species of righteousness which the Lord Jesus Christ prescribes to his disciples, and without which he declares that they shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven; and this, accordingly, is the life which is insisted upon in the doctrines of the New Church. The ten commandments, those doctrines affirm, understood both naturally and spiritually, are the rule of life for Christians. Let any one who wishes to see this clearly proved, consult that work of Swedenborg's, which treats expressly and solely on this subject: it is called, *The Doctrine of Life for the New Jerusalem, from the Commandments of the Decalogue*. It consists of fourteen chapters, in which the same number of leading propositions is stated and proved; and as they are all most profoundly important, and show in the strongest light what our doctrines are upon this truly vital subject, I will here repeat them.

The first—the sentiment with which the work opens, and which it lays down as the fundamental of all, is one which ought to be written in letters of gold in every church and in every house, and, most indispensably, on every heart: It is, *That all Religion has relation to life; and that the life of Religion is to do good*. The next affirms, *That no one can do good which is really good from himself*. The third declares, *That so far as man shuns evil as sins, so far he does good, not*

* Matt. v. 21 — 28.

from himself, but from the Lord. The fourth states, *That so far as any one shuns evils as sins, so far he loves truths.* The fifth pronounces, *That so far as any one shuns evils as sins, so far he hath faith, and is a spiritual man.* The sixth observes, *That the decalogue points out what evils are sins.* The seventh explains, *That murders, adulteries, thefts, and false witnesses, of every kind, are the evils which are to be shunned as sins.* The four next evince, *That so far as any one shuns these evils as sins, he is in the opposite good; that so far as any one thus shuns murder of every kind, he loves his neighbor; so far as any one thus shuns adultery, he loves chastity; so far as any one thus shuns theft, he loves honesty; and so far as any one thus shuns false witness, or lying, he loves truth.* The twelfth demonstrates, *That no one can shun evils as sins, so as to hold them in aversion, but by combatting against them.* The thirteenth assures us, *That man ought to shun evils as sins, and to fight against them, as if he could do it from himself* (because the Lord is present with every one that strives, and gives him the power). The fourteenth discloses, *That if any one shuns evils from any other motive than because they are sins, he in reality does not shun them, but only prevents them from showing themselves before the world.* — This, my Candid Readers, is our doctrine on the life that leads to heaven: I appeal to you whether any doctrine can go more completely to the root of all evil. Is it not evident, that when this doctrine affirms respecting each of the evils prohibited in the Decalogue, that every kind of such evil is to be shunned as sin, it goes to the full extent of the Lord's requirement, that the righteousness of his disciples should exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees?

To show what is meant by shunning all the kinds of each general evil, I will mention how this is explained in the chapter on the precept respecting shunning adultery; and I select that subject, because it is one respecting which the most atrocious calumnies have been circulated against the doctrines of the New Church and the writings of Swedenborg: "By committing adultery is meant," says the enlightened author, "in the sixth commandment of the Decalogue, in a natural sense, not only the external crime, but also all obscene practices, wanton discourse, and filthy thoughts: but, in a spiritual sense, by committing adultery is meant to adulterate the good things taught in the Word, and to falsify its truths: and in the supreme sense, by committing adultery is meant to deny the Lord's Divinity, and to profane the Word: — And they are guilty of all these kinds of adultery together, who do not, both in faith and life, hold adulteries to be sins." After showing how diametrically opposite the uncleanness of adultery is to the chastity

of marriage, he presently adds, "Hence it may plainly be concluded and seen, whether a man is a Christian or not, — yea, whether a man has any religion or not. He who does not, both in faith and life, hold adulteries as sins, is not a Christian, and has no religion. On the other hand, he who shuns adulteries as sins; and still more, he who on that account holds them in aversion; and still more, he who on that account abominates them; has religion, and is a Christian." — Does not this come up to the full doctrine of the Lord Jesus Christ? Is it not his doctrine in all its integrity and purity? And as all the other evils prohibited by the Decalogue are laid open in the same searching manner, — I will not say, what a want of integrity, — but what ignorance of the subject, is displayed by those, who can reproach the doctrine of the New Church for its "loose principles!" All principles that are commandments of God they enforce in all their fullness: they are only indifferent about such matters as are Pharisaical additions to the laws of God, — the mere commandments of men, vain traditions, the tendency of which is, to withdraw attention from the commandments of God, and to make them of none effect.

We have now seen, from the most authentic source, what the Doctrine of Life promulgated by Swedenborg, and held by those who believe that a New Church is meant by the New Jerusalem, truly is; and we appeal to all the Candid to say, whether it is not, in the strictest sense of the words, a doctrine of genuine holiness?

SECTION IX.

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.

PART II.

Holiness, not Laxity, encouraged by the Sentiment, That it is not so Difficult to live the Life that leads to Heaven as some suppose.

In the preceding PART of this SECTION I have offered a general vindication of the doctrines of the New Church upon the subject of the Christian Life; I will here reply to the specific charges made against us, on this head, by my usual guide.

The following is the passage in which he puts them forth in the most explicit form, and makes a show of supporting them by Scripture; "A Swedenborgian, according to an indulgence warranted by his great leader, 'may go to a play,' may 'sing a song,' besides some other little indulgences which it is needless here to mention. In addition to which, one of his chapters is headed in the following words: '*That it is not so difficult to live for Heaven as some suppose.*' In the puritanical days which obtained in this nation about one hundred and fifty years or thereabouts, this kind of teaching would have been esteemed unorthodox; neither do I think that the last quoted sentence, which makes heaven so easy of access, will very well accord with some passages in the New Testament, as for instance, 'Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling.'—'Give all diligence to make your calling and election sure.'—'If the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and sinner appear.' (1 Pet. iv. 18). And mark our Lord's words, for they are awfully emphatical: 'Enter ye in at the straight gate; for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be that go in thereat: because straight is the gate and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.' (Matt. vii. 13, 14). 'Strive to enter in at the strait gate; for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in and shall not be able.' (Luke xiii. 24). And likewise we have in the parable of the sower and the seed, four kinds of hearers described, and yet only *one* of the four kinds finally attain salvation. (Matt. xiii. 3—9). Now, there being naturally too much inclination in our constitution both of body and mind towards laxity and indolence in spiritual duties, there appears no necessity that we should have the sanction of a written prescription for *dealing with a slack hand, and for being at ease in Zion!*"* More strange misstatement was never made than is couched in these sentences.

The doctrines of the New Church insist, as has been just shown, that the life which leads to heaven is of the most pure and holy nature: but they certainly do not affirm, as do the doctrines generally prevailing, that man has no power, either from himself, or from the Lord, to live such a life. Far from *shutting up the kingdom of heaven against men*, by telling them that the life which leads to it is so difficult that no one can comply with its requisitions, they encourage us by the assurance, *That it is not so difficult to live the life that leads to heaven as some suppose*; and for this comforting, elevating sentiment, the design of which is solely to encourage those to set in earnest about the all-necessary work who otherwise might be dis-

* Pp. 3, 4.

heartened and to sit down in despair, the Scribes and Pharisees of modern times cry out against them, as giving a *written prescription for being at ease in Zion!* They would fain have it believed, that, in delivering this sentiment, our doctrines mean to encourage sinners in their evil ways, by intimating that they need not be over particular about yielding obedience to the commandments of God. Amazing perversion! The life that leads to heaven, it is constantly shown in our doctrine, is a life of genuine goodness; we are taught to believe, that, through the Divine Mercy, it is not so difficult to live a life of genuine goodness as some, who have never attempted it, suppose and represent: and this is construed as implying a license to live a life of wickedness, with the flattering unction, that a bad life will not exclude from heaven! And by whom is this perversion of our pure doctrines made? *By those who, in effect, teach the very doctrine which they thus charge against us!* By those who, while they affirm that a good life follows faith as a thing of course, deny it to have any thing to do with, or to form any part of, the conditions of salvation! By those who affirm that a man may be saved by faith in his last moments, let the whole of his previous life have been as wicked as it may, and who thus practically demonstrate, that, in their estimation, a good life forms no part of the way to heaven! By those who, in this persuasion, besiege the death-beds both of those who lived good lives and of those who have done the contrary, to persuade the former that their having abstained from wickedness will not be of any avail in securing their happiness hereafter, and to assure the latter that their having lived in wickedness needs be no hindrance to their eternal happiness: but that both may now equally secure salvation by what they call faith! By those who, under this persuasion, throng the condemned cell and the platform of execution, and when the terrified ruffian, in the state of constraint that attends the certainty of present death, yields to the influence of their exhortations and prayers, exult in having destroyed, as far as in them lies, the eternal barrier between good and evil, and proclaim with triumph, that they have dismissed the plunderer of his fellows, the violator of innocence, the murderer of his brethren, to certain glory! If this is not breaking the divine commandments, and teaching men so, by encouraging them to believe that their lot in eternity will be the same as if they had kept them, it will be difficult to say what is. And yet these charge such breaking of the divine commandments upon the doctrines of the New Church, for teaching, that as no life but a life of goodness leads to heaven, it is actually possible to live such a life, and is even not so difficult as some suppose! But

here lies the secret. Such a sentiment overturns from the foundation the doctrine of faith and salvation by them professed. *That* doctrine all proceeds upon the supposition, that man *cannot* keep the divine commandments. Once establish the contrary to be the truth: once rescue the Divine Goodness from the blasphemous imputation of having given man a law that he cannot keep, and then condemning him to eternal torments for the breach of it; and down tumbles at once all the fabric of the "scheme of salvation," which certain modern theologians have invented out of their own heads, and then fathered upon the Word of God; though the Word of God lends no countenance to the fiction, and primitive Christianity knew nothing of it. When therefore the doctrines of the New Church vindicate the Divine justice from such aspersions, by affirming that man *can* keep the Divine Commandments, and that the Lord Jesus Christ did not come into the world to make his keeping them unnecessary, but to give him power to keep them in the manner he requires, the advocates of the common "scheme of salvation" take alarm: but when our doctrines proceed a step further; when they vindicate the Divine Goodness as well as the Divine Justice, by affirming that, owing to the Divine Goodness, man not only has power given him to keep the Divine Commandments, but that the keeping of them is not so difficult as some suppose; there are men who are ready to invent any fictions that may prevent so blessed and affecting a truth from making its way into the hearts and understandings of the penitent and sincere.

Is, however, the sentiment, which is found so obnoxious, true, or is it not? Is it as difficult to live for heaven as some suppose, or is it not?

There is nothing in this assertion, be it observed, which affirms, absolutely, that it is *not* difficult to live the life that leads to heaven: for any thing that is here said to the contrary, it may be allowed to be extremely difficult; and yet all the adversary's remarks are levelled against the notion, that it is *not at all difficult*; as if this were advanced in the proposition. Thus nothing which he has said against it applies to the proposition itself, but only to what he has substituted in his thoughts, and sets before his readers, in its place. Accordingly, the texts which he quotes against it afford no contradiction whatever to the assertion, that it is not so difficult to live the life which leads to heaven *as is supposed*, but only to the notion, that it is *so easy*, or is a matter of so little importance, *as to justify man in carelessness and indifference*.

Thus, the first text which he cites is, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling;" which refers neither to the

difficulty of the work, nor to its easiness, but only to the awful consequences of neglecting it which ought to excite us to set about it with the utmost solicitude: and this is a sentiment which every tenet of the New Church unites to confirm. To the same purport, though without allusion to the ill consequences of an opposite conduct, is the next citation: "Give all diligence to make your calling and election sure." So, when Peter, says, "If the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear," he does not mean that to live the life which leads to heaven, or so as to be reckoned among the righteous, is a work of such extreme difficulty, but that they who do so live, and are accepted as righteous, have nothing to boast of—that there can be no works of supererogation, since, at the utmost, we are unprofitable servants, who can do no more than it is our duty to do. But our opponent seems to rely most upon the Lord's own words, which he justly denominates "awfully emphatical;" "Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, that leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it;" And again: "Strive to enter in at the strait gate, for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able." But an attention to the context plainly shows, that the Divine Speaker is here referring to the difficulty, or rather the impossibility, of entering the gate of heaven *in the other life*, when preparation has not been made for heaven by a suitable life here, but not to any extreme difficulty attending the living of such a life here. Thus the Lord carries on the subject by immediately adding to the last extract, "When once the Master of the house is risen up, and hath shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, Lord, Lord, open unto us; and he shall answer and say unto you, I know you not whence ye are: then shall ye begin to say, We have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and thou hast taught in our streets: but he shall say, I tell you, I know you not whence ye are; depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity." How plain is it from hence, that the subject relates to the impossibility of entering heaven *hereafter*, if we have neglected our opportunities here,—not to the difficulty of now applying those opportunities to the purpose for which they are granted us. The gate of heaven is too narrow to let in any thing evil, or any evil doer who has not overcome his evil habits by actual repentance and by a suitable after life: it is only the gate of hell that is wide enough for these; and it ever yawns greedily to receive them. To avoid this fate, and to secure the other, we are to strive *now*; before "the Master of the house is risen

up," — before he "hath shut to the door," which terminates our state of probation; and never does the Lord intimate that, *before the door is shut to*, the work of acquiring the passport of admission, is a work of such extreme difficulty. There is a time in which we can work, and a time in which we cannot; and the one is separated from the other by the grave. As followers of our Divine Master, we are to "work the works of our heavenly Father while it is day; for the night cometh when no man can work."* "Are there not twelve hours in the day? If any man walk in the day, he stumbleth not, because he seeth the light of this world."† Therefore, "Walk while ye have the light, lest darkness come upon you."‡ Perfectly evident then it is, that the difficulty to which the Lord refers when he speaks of the straitness of the gate of heaven, is not the difficulty of so walking, during our day of probation, as to be able to find it, but the difficulty of finding it, and entering in at it, after death, — after having slept away all the twelve hours of our day here, instead of walking and working in them. If, also, his words could be so strained as to include the other meaning, it would be making the Divine Saviour contradict himself: for does he not say, "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me: for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls: for my yoke is easy, and my burden is light?"§ Here is a declaration which is perfectly clear and explicit: and when the Lord himself declares that his yoke is easy and his burden light, who shall contradict him by saying, that his yoke is galling, and his burden oppressive? To take upon us his yoke and burden, is to follow him: to follow him, is to live the life that he requires of us, which is the life that leads to heaven: and when he declares this to be easy and pleasant, who shall affirm it to be difficult and almost impracticable? The beloved disciple, than whom no one ever more completely took on him his Master's yoke, and was more highly qualified to speak of its nature, knew better: he says, "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments; and his commandments *are not grievous*;"|| or, as the original word literally signifies, "*are not heavy*," or "*burdensome*." To keep the Lord's commandments, is certainly to live the life that leads to heaven: if then his commandments are not grievous or burdensome, it is evident that to live the life which leads to heaven is not a task of such extreme difficulty. The opponent, however, *declares that it is very difficult*: evidently, then the New Church sentiment is true in the fullest extent, when it affirms, that it is not so difficult to live the life which leads to heaven "as some suppose."

* John ix. 4.

† Ch. xi. 9.

‡ Ch. xii. 35.

§ Matt. xi. 29, 30.

|| 1 John v. 8.

Behold then, in this example of the contrariety upon this subject between the doctrines of the New Church and those of her adversaries, the old controversy revived of Caleb and Joshua with the other ten spies, respecting the ability of the people to take possession of the promised land. The New Church encourages the people, and says with faithful Caleb, "Let us go up at once to possess it: for we are well able to overcome it."* But her adversaries exclaim, with the unfaithful ten, "We be not able to go up against the people, for they are stronger than we."† "And they brought up an evil report of the land which they had searched, unto the children of Israel, saying, The land through which we have gone to search it, is a land that eateth up the inhabitants thereof; and all the people that we saw in it are men of great stature. And there we saw the giants, the sons of Anak, which come of the giants: and we were in our own sight as grass-hoppers, and so we were in their sight."‡

Since, then, it is perfectly evident that the Scriptures never represent the life that leads to heaven as a thing of great difficulty; and since, when our doctrines affirm that it is not so difficult to live the life that leads to heaven as some suppose, they by no means affirm that it is attended with no difficulty whatever; and since it thus is certain that the Scriptures and our doctrines are here in perfect harmony; all that is necessary to clear the subject of all remaining obscurity, is, briefly to state in what manner the illustrious Author of the treatise on Heaven and Hell explains his proposition, and proves that the difficulty of living for heaven is not so great as is too often imagined.

He begins with stating what the unnecessary difficulties are with which the imaginations of men have clogged the way to heaven: which he does thus: "Some people believe, that to live a life which leads to heaven is difficult, because they have been told that man must renounce the world, and reject the concupiscences of the body and the flesh, and must live a spiritual life; which they understand as implying, that they must reject worldly things, which consist chiefly in riches and honors, that they must be engaged continually in pious meditation about God, salvation, and eternal life, and must spend their lives in prayer, and in reading the Word and other pious books: and this they call renouncing the world, and living in the spirit and not in the flesh. But the fact is, that they who renounce the world and live in the spirit after this manner, procure to themselves a melancholy habit of life which is not receptive of heavenly joy. But in order to man's receiving the life of heaven, it is necessary to live in the world, engaged in some business or employment; in order that, by fulfilling the duties of moral and civil

* Numb. xiii. 30.

.† Ver. 31.

‡ Ver. 32, 33

life, he may receive spiritual life. For spiritual life cannot otherwise be formed with man, or his spirit prepared for heaven : for to live an internal life and not an external life at the same time, is like dwelling in a house which has no foundation, which either sinks into the ground, or cracks to pieces, and at last falls down.”* Here, then, some of the difficulties with which, in the opinion of some, the life that leads to heaven is attended, are at once cleared away ; — all the mummary of superstition and popish mortification, — all that mistaken renunciation of the world which withdraws a man entirely from its business and its duties. The author then proceeds to show, that truly spiritual life is nothing but civil and moral life lived from spiritual motives ; and thence, again, he infers, that it is not so difficult to live the life which leads to heaven as is generally supposed. For, says he, “ Who cannot live a civil and moral life when every one is initiated into it from his infancy, and comes into the knowledge of it by his life in the world ? Every one also brings the principles of civil and moral life into act, he who is inwardly bad, as well as he who is inwardly good : for who does not wish to be esteemed a sincere and just man ? Almost all exercise sincerity and injustice *externally*, so as to appear as if they were sincere and just in heart. Let, then, the spiritual man do the same, which he surely is able to do as easily as the natural man ; only, as the spiritual man believes in God, he must practise sincerity and justice, not only because civil and moral laws require it, but also, because the divine laws require it. Thus, as the spiritual man, when he acts, has the divine laws in his thoughts, he is in communion with the angels, and, so far as this is the case, he comes into conjunction with them, and so his internal man is opened, which is the real spiritual man. When such is a man’s character and equality, he is adopted and led by the Lord, although he is not aware of it ; and thus the acts of sincerity and justice belonging to the moral and civil life are performed by him from a spiritual origin ; and this is to perform them from the essential principles of justice and sincerity, or to do them from the heart.”† This is illustrated at length, and is applied to the case of the ten commandments. It is shown that many mere men of the world keep the ten commandments in outward form, as mere civil and moral laws, for the sake of maintaining a fair character in society ; and the intended inference is, What is to hinder the man who wishes to become spiritual from keeping them as divine laws likewise, avoiding the breach of them as sins against God ; when the Lord and the angels are ever present with the mind of every one who thus regards them, continually leading him,

* H. and H. n. 528.

† N, 530,

and communicating the necessary ability? I will add a few sentences which deliver the practical purport of the whole: "That it is not so difficult to live the life of heaven as is supposed, is evident now from this consideration: That nothing more is necessary, than for a man to think, when any thing presents itself to him which he knows to be insincere and wrong, and to which he feels inclined, that it ought not to be done, because it is contrary to God's commandments. If he accustoms himself so to think, and thus acquires a habit of it, he by degrees is conjoined to heaven; and as the higher principles of his mind are opened in consequence, he distinctly sees what is insincere and unjust; and as he sees them, they may be loosened and expelled from his mind; for it is impossible that any evil can be expelled until it is seen. But when he has made a beginning, the Lord operates all sorts of good in him, and gives him the faculty, not only of seeing evils, but also of not willing them, and finally of holding them in aversion; this is meant by the Lord's words, 'My yoke is easy, and my burden is light.' " — But here follows a most momentous remark, which shows that the writer never intended to represent the work as unattended with any difficulty whatever: he adds: "It is however to be noted, that *the difficulty of so thinking, and likewise of resisting evils increases*, in proportion as man proceeds to the actual commission of evils from the will; for by so doing he accustoms himself to evils, till at length he does not see them: and next he is led to love them, and from the delight of love to excuse them, and by all kinds of fallacies to confirm them, saying that they are allowable and good. This is the case with those, who, on coming to adult age, plunge into evils without restraint, and at the same time reject all regard for divine things from their heart."*

I know not how these sentiments may affect our accusers; but by all the Candid and Reflecting they surely will be thought to carry their own recommendation with them, and to evince, by their intrinsic excellence, that they are the very truth of heaven. They are equally calculated to repress presumption, and to foster hope: they prove that man may, with less difficulty than has been supposed, live the life that leads to heaven, and yet that all the good of such a life is not of man but of the Lord alone: and that man himself greatly aggravates the difficulty by neglecting his opportunities. Never before, I believe, was this difficult subject treated, in any human writings, with such clearness and consistency. Surely it must require the front of the arch-accuser of the brethren himself, *seriously*, to look at such sentiments, and impute to them any other character than that of holiness and truth.

But, says the accuser in the present case, “a Swedenborgian, according to an indulgence warranted by his great leader, may ‘go to a play,’ may ‘sing a song,’ besides some other little indulgencies which it is needless here to mention.” How pitiful are such charges! What mere Pharisaism do they breathe! How plainly do we see in them the same spirit which exclaimed on one occasion, “Why eateth your Master with publicans and sinners?”* on another, because “the Son of man came eating and drinking,” “Behold a man gluttonous and a wine bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners!”† They breathe a revival of the spirit which was eager to “bind heavy burdens, and grievous to be borne, and to lay them on men’s shoulders;” — which “tithes mint and anise and cummin, but omits the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith;” — which “strains at a gnat, but swallows a camel.”‡ They are, in short, the dictates of the same spirit as said of the Saviour in person “We know that this man is a sinner.”§ What was the pretence for this blasphemous accusation? Because the Divine Object of it refused to acknowledge the additions which the Scribes and Pharisees had presumed to make to his own law: and because the doctrines of the New Church are equally regardless of such additions by modern Scribes and Pharisees, they are pursued with similar reproaches. The proper answer is that which, on one occasion was made to the Pharisees by the Lord himself: “If ye had known what that meaneth, I desire mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless.”||

I will now only add on this subject, that, although, according to the Doctrines of the New Church, all the faculties belonging to human nature in a state of order, from highest to lowest, may be allowed the recreations proper for keeping them in a healthful state, capable of discharging their proper functions in the great whole, whence even the recreations proper to the body and the senses are not condemned as criminal in themselves; yet to insinuate from this reasonable and Scriptural truth that our doctrines encourage any disorderly gratification of the lower faculties, — any thing that tends to lift them out of their proper subordination to the mental and truly spiritual part, — is a gross, unfounded calumny. Nothing is more insisted upon in the doctrines of our church, than the debasing tendency of pursuing carnal and sensual gratifications, — of the pursuit of them, in any degree whatever, as ruling ends and objects. *Of persons who had been devoted to the pursuit of what is called pleasure, our doctrines teach a very great proportion of the inhabitants of*

* Matt. ix. 11.

† Ch. xi. 19.

‡ Ch. xxiii. 4, 23, 24.

§ John ix. 24.

|| Matt. xii. 7.

hell consists. Because, then, we affirm that the life which leads to heaven does not consist in monkish mortifications ; because, to use the apostle's language, we do not adopt the precepts of " touch not, taste not, handle not, after the commandments and doctrines of man ; which things," as he also affirms, " have [merely] a show of wisdom, in will-worship and [affected] humility, and neglecting of the body ;"* it is the extreme of injustice in the devotees of will-worship to tax us with encouraging the love of pleasure and dissipation. We are satisfied that, in its spiritual as well as in its literal sense, the precept, " Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God, the things which are God's," is a mandate of Divinity ; and in its spiritual sense we understand it to teach, that though the world, and the things belonging to the world, including that part of man's constitution which is connected with the world, may, in their proper station, and in the order intended by their Creator, have their necessary share of attention, they must not be allowed to encroach upon our duty to God, engross any share of our supreme affections, or form any part of our ruling motives, which must all be sacred to God alone.

Nothing more needs be said to evince, that there is not anything in our doctrines which is calculated to attract to their banners the careless and the dissolute, who are indisposed to submit to the discipline of sincere repentance and reformation : these will rather fly to the flattering remedies of our opponents, who will undertake to set all right in a moment, though that may be the last moment of life. We reject not the sinner : but we tell him he must repent, not in words only, but in deed ; or, in the language of the gospel, that he must bring forth fruits worthy of repentance. We, however, dishearten no one by telling him that he cannot keep the law of God : we tell him that he can ; yea, and that it is not so difficult as he perhaps imagines. We learn of our Divine Master not to break the bruised reed nor quench the smoking flax : yet we adopt also his teaching from the heart, and say to the disciples whom we call to him, " Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.

* Col. ii. 21, 22, 23.

SECTION IX.

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.

PART III.

Charity not infringed by Swedenborg's Exposure of the Errors of a Perverted Church.

I HAVE had occasion to observe above, that "piety to God and charity to man form the soul, both of Swedenborg's system and of his conduct." It is certain that charity is affirmed, in his writings, as in those of Paul,* to be the greatest of Christian graces; yet his accusers pretend, that it is one in which he was extremely deficient himself. Upon the same ground, however, on which this charge is attempted to be established against Swedenborg, it might as truly be brought against the Apostle, and even against their Divine Master: it is purely because, in his writings, he treats evil as evil, and darkness as darkness, and does not, as those who are confirmed in false sentiments would prefer, "heal the hurt of the daughter of the Lord's people slightly, saying, Peace, peace, when there is no peace."†

Scripture expressly affirms (in Matt. xxiv. and the corresponding chapters of Mark and Luke, in many parts of the Apostolic writings, and in the Revelation throughout), that the most deplorable evils and errors *would* successively devastate the Christian church, insomuch that a judgment would at length be passed on its corruptions, and God would depart from those who uphold them, to dwell with the new dispensation of pure Christianity delineated as the New Jerusalem: the Apostle, in a holy zeal, exclaims, "Let God be true, and every man a liar:"‡ but Swedenborg, only for declaring that God is true, and that his predictions are fulfilled, is charged with an unpardonable breach of charity. But what does this prove, but that conviction of error, now, as of old, is deeply resented by those confirmed in it? "And the chief priests and the scribes the same hour sought to lay hold on him; for they perceived that he had spoken this parable against him."§

"In the Baron's writings" says my guide "the word *charity* is a very prominent word: of course we have a fair claim upon him, not only for the manifestation of much candor of ex-

* 1 Cor. xiii. 13.

† Rom. iii. 4.

† Jer. vi. 11.

§ Luke xx. 19.

pression, but also for a great share of benevolent feeling and brotherly love. How far he has satisfied our claims or gratified our expectation, will be seen in the following *Extracts* from a small tract published 'By the *Members of the New Jerusalem Church, who assembled in Great Eastcheap, London, 1788,*' entitled, '*Reasons for separating from the Old Church,*' &c. For the accuracy of these extracts the author does not vouch, but he will vouch for it that they are exactly copied from the tract in question."* These *Extracts* he presents under the title of "A Sample of Swedenborgian Charity.

As this tract has been also made use of by the Rev. Mr. Adam, who, in his work, "The Religious World Displayed," &c., gives the greater part of its contents as an authentic view of the doctrines of the New Church; whereas it was not drawn up as a view of the doctrines of the New Church, but only as a declaration of the errors of the doctrines called those of the Old Church; as, also, it has been reprinted, as a subject for obloquy, by adversaries of the New Church in America; I will here offer some account of its nature, and the occasion of its publication, from which it will be seen, that to give extracts from it as *specimens of Swedenborg's writings and sentiments*, is extremely deceptive.

In the years 1787 and 1788, when the approvers of the writings of Swedenborg had become pretty numerous, the question began to be earnestly discussed, whether it was right and necessary for those who accepted them to form societies for public worship in a distinct manner, or whether it was more expedient for individuals to remain, for some time longer, in connection with the Church of England, or the various denominations of Dissenters to which they might previously have belonged. Tracts were written on both sides; and both drew from the writings of Swedenborg conclusions in favor of their own sentiments. Public worship, however, in a distinct form, was commenced by those members of the New Church in London who approved the measure, in a chapel in Great Eastcheap, in 1788. By them, in justification of the step they were taking, and to induce their brethren to join them in it, was issued the tract in question. It, of course, was never intended for the public in general, but only for the readers of Swedenborg's writings. By them, the extracts from, or rather, references to, those writings, would be rightly understood; but as, in many instances, the compilers give their own conclusions from the passages referred to, rather than the words of the passages themselves, persons unacquainted with those writings would form from these statements an inaccurate judgment.

* Pp. 72, 73.

For instance : In most of the extract here cited, the words "Old Church" occur : but they are only found in one or two of the passages of the writings of Swedenborg to which reference is made ; and in one of them,* the "Old Church" mentioned is *the Jewish Church*. In explanation of the phrase, the writer I follow gives this comment ; "It may be necessary to remind the reader, that, in perusing these extracts, he is to bear in mind, that by the '*Old Church*,' so often mentioned, is to be understood both the *Roman Catholics, and Protestants of every denomination !*" This however is not Swedenborg's account of the matter, but is quite inconsistent with it. His censures are always chiefly directed against the *false doctrines* of the Church, as established *among* Roman Catholics and Protestants, and only against those *persons* who are confirmed in those false doctrines in consequence of being immersed in evils of life. But so far is he from affirming that this is the case with *all* in the Christian world at this day, that he declares, that by *the seven churches*, to whom the Revelation is addressed, "are described all those in the Christian church who have any religion, and out of whom the New Church, which is the New Jerusalem, can be formed."† Thus, he considers the inhabitants of Christendom, at this day, as divided into *three* great classes ; 1. Those represented in the Revelation by the seven churches to whom the book is addressed ; 2. Those represented by Babylon ; and 3. Those represented by the dragon and his two beasts : the two latter being those which constitute the "Old Church," but not the former, though mixed with them and undistinguished from them. The doctrines generally professed are, indeed, those of the two latter : but according to Swedenborg's view, in all denominations are many, who, although, for want of opportunity of knowing better, they profess the common doctrines, are not confirmed in the false sentiments which abound in those doctrines, but in their hearts, have an idea of the Lord's Humanity as being Divine, and who live in the habit of abstinence from evils. Hence we find him, even in the extracts cited to prove his uncharitableness, speaking so well of the state of many in the other world : hence he speaks of Christians, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, as being in the centre of all in that world ; of Protestants as being in the centre of all Christians ; and of the English as being in the centre of all Protestants. This would be inconsistency indeed, if he considered all who pass under the denomination of Roman Catholics, and all who pass under the denomination of Protestants, as belonging to what he sometimes, and his disciples more frequently, denominate "the Old Church : " though the professions of faith generally received,

* Ap. Rev. n. 707.

† Ap. Rev. n. 62.

according to which the public worship of all denominations of professing Christians is constituted, belong to "the Old Church" only.

The extracts, then, cited from the "*Reasons for separating from the Old Church*," do not bear the harsh or uncharitable character which accusers would assign them, for three reasons : *first*, because the phrase, "Old Church," is not in general used by Swedenborg himself in the places referred to : *secondly*, because, if it were, it would not be used in the sense assigned it by adversaries, but as applying more to principles than to persons, and by no means to *all* the persons who profess the common doctrines : *thirdly*, because, to affirm of evil and false principles that they really are such, and thus to prevent persons from accepting, or abiding in, what would endanger their salvation, instead of being a mark of want of charity, evinces real charity, and concern for men's souls.

To show that such is the character of the warnings on these subjects as they exist in the writings of Swedenborg himself, we will take two of the strongest of the extracts adduced by my guide from the tract he mentions, and will subjoin the passages in the writings of Swedenborg on which they are founded.

An extract says, "That there is nothing spiritual remaining in the Old Church, but that it is full of blasphemy against the Lord:" and refers for its authority to Tr. Chr. Rel. n. 132, 133, Ap. Rev. n. 692, 715. In the Tr. Chr. Rel., in the preceding article, it is shown, "That the Passion of the Cross was not Redemption itself, but was the last temptation which the Lord endured as the grand Prophet, and that it was the means of the Glorification of his Humanity, that is, of Union with the Divinity of his Father." Then, at the place referred to, this proposition is advanced and illustrated : "That it is a fundamental error of the Church to believe the Passion of the Cross to be Redemption itself; and that this error, together with that relating to Three Divine Persons from Eternity, has perverted the whole church, so that nothing spiritual is left remaining in it." — The following are some of the strongest of the remarks offered in illustration of this proposition : "What doctrine more abounds in the books of the orthodox at this day, or what is more zealously taught and insisted on in the schools of divinity, or more constantly preached and extolled in the pulpit, than this : That God the Father being full of wrath against mankind, not only separated them from himself, but also sentenced them to universal damnation, thus excommunicated them from his favor; but because he was gracious and merciful, that he persuaded or excited his Son to descend, and take upon himself the determined curse, and thus appease the wrath of his Father,

and that thus, and no otherwise, could the Father be prevailed upon to look again with an eye of mercy on mankind? — But who that hath his reason enlightened by the Word, cannot see that God is mercy itself, and clemency itself, because he is love itself and goodness itself, and that these constitute his essence: consequently, that it is a contradiction to say, that mercy itself or goodness itself can behold man with an angry eye, and sentence the whole race to damnation, and still abide in its own divine essence? Such dispositions are never ascribed to a good man, or an angel of heaven, but only to a wicked man, and a spirit of hell; it is therefore blasphemy to ascribe them to God. From this idea concerning God and redemption, the whole system of theology has lost its spirituality, and is become in the lowest degree natural: this was the necessary consequence of ascribing to God merely natural properties and attributes.” — Here the author’s language is undoubtedly strong; but if the sentiments it conveys are just, it assuredly is far from being too strong for the occasion. And where is there any absence of charity in it, when it is not applied to persons, but only to a “system of theology.”

The passages referred to in the *Ap. Rev.*, are those in which these words are explained: “And men were scorched with great heat and blasphemed the name of God, which hath power over these plagues.” — “And men blasphemed God because of the plague of the hail; for the plague thereof was exceeding great.”* According to Swedenborg, this whole chapter relates to those in the Protestant Church who are “in faith separated from charity *both in respect to doctrine and in respect to life.*” He explains the first of the above passages as signifying, that such persons, “owing to the delight of the love of self arising from dreadful evil lusts, did not acknowledge the Divinity of the Lord’s Humanity:” and the second he interprets to mean, “that they who have confirmed in themselves direful false persuasions, have denied truths to such a degree as to be no longer able to acknowledge them, owing to the repugnance against them occasioned by their inward false persuasions and evil lusts.” His meaning is, that such is discovered to be their state at the time of the last judgment. Now to charge this with want of charity, is to reproach the sacred text itself, and not its expositor. The sacred text declares, that certain persons would arise in the church whose states would be grievous: and when the expositor affirms that these persons are they who are in faith separated from charity both in doctrine and in life, and who are in direful false persuasions and evil lusts; who will say that the application is unjust? Will the opponent deny that there are,

* Ch. xvi. 9, 21.

or ever have been, any such characters? If he cannot do this how can he impute want of charity to Swedenborg for stating the fact, and for pointing out the awful nature of the state as a warning to others? It would appear as if he felt like the lawyer in the gospel, on hearing the Lord's condemnation of the Scribes and Pharisees: "Then answered one of the lawyers and said unto him, Master, thus saying, *thou reproachest us also.*"* I forbear to add the sequel.

We will take one other example. One of the extracts presented is the following: "That there is not a single truth remaining in the Old Church which is not falsified and brought to its consummation: and that this is signified by the abomination of desolation spoken of by the prophet Daniel." For the foundation of this statement we are referred to Tr. Ch. Rel. n. 174, 177, 180, 758. In the first of these places the following proposition is advanced: "That a Trinity of Persons was unknown in the Apostolic Church, and that the Doctrine took its rise from the Council of Nice, from which it was introduced into the Roman Catholic Church, and was thence propagated among the Reformed Churches. After a brief historical statement respecting the Council of Nice and the circumstances that led to it, the author proceeds thus: "From that time an incredible number of heresies, respecting God, and the person of Christ, began to spring up; whereby the head of Antichrist was exalted, and God was divided into three persons, and the Lord the Saviour into two: and thus the temple which the Lord had built by his Apostles was destroyed, and that so effectually, that there was not one stone left upon another which was not thrown down, according to his own words, Matt. xxiv. 2; where by the temple is not meant the temple at Jerusalem only, but the church also, of whose consummation or end that chapter treats throughout. But what else could be expected from that council, and from the others which succeeded it, which divided the Divinity, in like manner, into three persons, and placed the Incarnate God below them on their footstool? For they removed the head of the church from its body, in consequence of *climbing up another way*: that is, they passed by the Incarnate God, and climbed up to God the Father, as to another person, with only the mention of Christ's merits in their mouths, as an inducement to the Father to have mercy on them; believing that they should thus receive instantaneous justification, with all its attendant graces, such as remission of sins, renovation, sanctification, regeneration, and salvation; and all this without the use of any means on the part of man." And in n. 177, after some similar remarks, in which he illustrates how little dependence is to be

* Luke xi. 45.

placed on councils, by mentioning the palpable abominations which some of them have sanctioned, he concludes the subject with this affecting exhortation: "But do you, my friend, go to the God of the Word, and thus to the Word itself, and enter by the door into the sheepfold, that is, into the church, and you will be enlightened; and then you will see, as from a high mountain, not only the errors of many others, but also your own former bewildered wanderings at the foot of the mountain."

Now in all this, where is there any breach of charity? False doctrines, it is true, are exposed with a clearness of illustration that renders their falsehood palpable, and with a strength of language well calculated to awaken attention in those who are slumbering in them: but the objects of the writer's severity are always *destructive principles*, not *deluded persons*: while for the persons who have been, or are in danger of being, deluded by them, he evinces the tenderest solicitude.

All the other passages referred to in the selected extracts are equally replete with most solemn truths, and equally consistent with the purest charity.

Some, however, may possibly think, that Swedenborg exhibits the false doctrines of the day in more than their native deformity, and that such sentiments as he explodes are not really included in the popular creeds. To guard against this mistake, he prefixes to his '*Apocalypse Revealed*,' and to his '*Brief Exposition of the Doctrine of the New Church*,' summary views of the doctrines both of Roman Catholics and Protestants in their own words, the former taken from the decrees of the Council of Trent, and the latter from the book called *Formula Concordiæ*, which is an exposition of the doctrine of Protestants, agreed upon by most of the Lutheran churches on the continent, and subscribed by their ministers at their ordination.

What the doctrine generally prevailing respecting the Trinity is, is known from the Athanasian creed: but that many carry the work of division in the Divine Being farther than that creed sanctions, and actually, beside dividing God into three divide the Saviour into two, as stated in the last extract, is a fact of which many, perhaps, are not aware. It is however done by Calvin and his followers. A popular example of it may be seen in a sermon of Dr. Watts's which he calls *the 'Scale of Blessedness*;' in which, after describing the blessedness of saints and angels, he proceeds to delineate that of "the man Christ Jesus," meaning the Human Nature of our Lord, which he places, as a man by itself, in heaven among the angels; after which he sketches the blessedness of the three Persons of the Trinity, one of whom he represents as the Divine Nature of our Lord, which he places, with the other two Persons, at an immense distance

above heaven, and above "the man Christ Jesus." This sermon was written by Watts when he was a young man, and was full of school-divinity upon the principles of Calvin; in his latter years he adopted more rational and scriptural sentiments.

This is a sufficient specimen of the divinity of the schools, being that which nearly all *profess*, whether they are aware of it or not, in regard to the Trinity in the Godhead and the Duality in Jesus Christ: I subjoin a few propositions from the *Formula Concordiæ* on *Justification by Faith without the works of the Law*, as quoted in the introduction to Swedenborg's *Brief Exposition*, where references to the pages of the work itself are accurately made. "That faith is imputed for righteousness without works, on account of Christ's merits, which are laid hold of by faith. That charity follows the faith that justifies; but that *faith is not justifying as being formed by charity*, as the Papists say. *That neither the contrition which precedes faith, nor the renovation and sanctification that follow it, nor good works thence, have any thing at all to do with the righteousness of faith. That it is foolish to dream that the works of the second table of the decalogue can justify man before God; for in them we have to deal with men, and not properly with God, and in the business of justification we have to do with God, and with the appeasing of his wrath. — If any one thinks to obtain remission of sins because he has charity, he casts a reproach upon Christ, because a man's trust in his own righteousness is impious and vain. — That good works are altogether to be excluded from the business of salvation and eternal life. — That good works are not necessary as a meritorious cause of salvation, and that they do not enter into the act of justification. — That the position, that good works are necessary to salvation, is to be rejected; because it takes away the consolation of the gospel, affords occasion for doubting of the grace of God, and brings in an opinion of man's own righteousness; and because it is accepted by the Papists to support a bad cause. That such forms of speech as imply good works to be necessary to salvation, are not to be used or defended, but to be exploded by all churches, and rejected as false. — That works, when they do not proceed from a true faith, are actually sins before God; that is, are defiled with sin, because a bad tree cannot bear good fruit. — That faith and salvation are not even preserved and retained by good works; for they are only tokens of the presence and indwelling of the Holy Ghost. — That the decision of the Council of Trent, — that good works preserve salvation; or that the righteousness of faith previously laid hold of, or faith itself, is retained and preserved by our works, either in whole or in part; — is deservedly to be rejected."*

Now will any candid and reflecting person say, that it is want of charity to treat such doctrines, respecting the Trinity and justification by faith alone, as utterly perverting the Christian church, wherever they are embraced and confirmed, and where their receivers actually neglect the charity and good works which are thus vilified in their doctrines as not necessary to salvation? Would it not rather be a want of charity, to suffer such doctrines, still unproved, to continue their desolating career? If, also, as has been shown in Sect. V., Swedenborg was a chosen instrument for restoring the lost truths of pure Christianity, how should he, if he saw the evil of the common doctrines and gave not warning, have “delivered his soul?” And, little as many may suspect it, the same pernicious sentiments as are stated above, are contained in the Articles of the Church of England, in the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the Assembly’s Catechism, received by the Church of Scotland, and in all the prevailing creeds, though they are not in all so openly disclosed in their proper deformity.

We have now, I apprehend, abundantly vindicated the Eastcheap document, which the accuser gives as “a sample of Swedenborgian charity,” so far as it expresses the sentiments of Swedenborg himself. The whole case may be illustrated thus: Suppose a man were to knock loudly at our accuser’s door in the middle of the night, and on his coming to the window to inquire the cause, should tell him that his house was on fire, and that unless he made haste out he would be in danger of perishing; and suppose the gentleman should answer, “You are very uncharitable to disturb me with such disagreeable news:” and without making any examination, should return to his bed and his sleep, and should persuade his wife and family to do the same: what would be thought either of his charity or his prudence? Yet this is an exact image of what he has done, in condemning, as uncharitableness, Swedenborg’s solemn information of the insecure state of his spiritual house and bed, — of the system of doctrine in which he reposes at his ease. Take another parallel case. “Come out of her, my people,” says the warning voice of the Apocalypse, “that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.”* “A fine specimen of angelic or divine charity, truly!” answers this gentleman: “regard not, my friends, the unkind intrusion: the ‘Old Church,’ depend upon it, ‘sits a queen, and is no widow, and shall see no sorrow.’† Though prophecy may announce the disownment by heaven of our doctrines, it will never, take my word for it, be fulfilled.”

* Chap. xviii. 4.

† Ver. 7.

But while Swedenborg affirms that prophecy is fulfilled, and that great evils and errors have, as was predicted, crept into the professing church; and while he exposes those evils and errors, and their deplorable consequences, with the uprightness essential to his character, and with the truly charitable motive of withdrawing his readers from them; far is he indeed from being infected with the least taint of that *odium theologicum*, that uncharitableness towards others, which has so extensively influenced the adherents of the different forms of the Christian religion, and which has brought so much disgrace upon the Christian name. Far is he, indeed, from partaking of that spirit, of which almost every sect has drunk so deeply, — that spirit which would limit salvation to those of their own denomination or party, or, at most, to those who make mention of the Saviour's name. Though fully acknowledging “that there is none other name under heaven given amongst men whereby we must be saved” but that of the Lord Jesus, he shows that the benefits of this name are not confined to those who, by the mere circumstance of birth, have had the opportunity of hearing it, but are extended to all in the universe; and that the apostle utters a real truth, and does not amuse by a solemn mockery, when he says, “Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.”* The Lord's church universal, he teaches, is indeed a catholic or universal church, including all the good of every denomination, and of every family of the human race; though the church particular, or where the Lord is known by his Word, is, to the rest, what the heart and lungs are to the body; thus that another Apostle declares a most certain truth when he says, that God “is the Saviour of *all* men; but *specially* of those that believe.”† Statements to this effect are contained in all his works; as a just “sample,” I will conclude this PART, with two short extracts, which, I am sure, all the Candid and Reflecting must acknowledge to contain the enlightened views of pure reason, and to breathe the expansive sentiments of genuine charity.

“The Lord provides that every religion should contain precepts similar to those in the Decalogue; as, that God is to be worshipped; that his name is not to be profaned; that sacred festivals are to be observed; that parents are to be honored; that man is not to commit murder; that he is not to commit adultery; that he is not to steal; that he is not to bear false witness. The gentiles who regard these laws as of divine authority, and live according to them from a principle of religion, are saved.”‡ “It is provided by the Lord, that whatever her-

* Acts x. 84, 85.

† 1 Tim. iv. 10.

‡ Div. Prov. n. 254.

esy a man may be in with regard to his understanding, he still may be reformed and saved, provided he shuns evils as sins, and does not confirm himself in the false doctrines of his heresy [which, as is shown elsewhere, can only be done, so as to be incapable of removal, by a wicked life]: for, by shunning evils, the will is reformed, and by the will, the understanding also, which then first comes out of a state of darkness into a state of light. The essentials of the church are three: the acknowledgment of the Lord's Divinity, the acknowledgment of the holiness of the Word, and the life which is called charity. According to the life, which is charity, is the state of every man in regard to faith; from the Word he acquires a knowledge of what his life ought to be; and from the Lord he obtains reformation and salvation. If these three things had been regarded as the essentials of the church, intellectual dissensions would not have divided, but would only have varied it; as the same light produces various colors in beautiful objects, and as various precious stones give such splendid beauty to a royal crown."*

Are not these the sentiments of genuine charity; and of reason and truth, in addition? Must not every attempt to impute to the enlightened mind that was the organ of expressing such heavenly sentiments, defect of charity, egregiously fail? Is not a life formed according to such doctrines to be urged upon all as most truly a CHRISTIAN LIFE?

I now close this Appeal; and to avoid protracting it further, I will make no additional attempt to recommend the subjects which have been considered to the favorable attention of you to whom it is addressed,—the Reflecting of all Denominations. I will only entreat you, as becomes men of reflection and thence of candor, to weigh what has been offered in the balance of a serious and impartial judgment, and under the influence of a real love of truth; and, in order that you may be guided aright in your decision, I would only earnestly beg of you to remember the request made in the introduction above (pp. 5, 6),—to put your minds, for the occasion, under the direction of HIM, who is the Truth itself, the Light of the world. Then, and then only, may you rely, that the Holy Spirit, which He sends from the Father, will guide you into all truth. The consequence, I trust, will be, that you will be brought to the conviction, that the important Doctrines of Faith and Life which have now been presented to your consideration, are those which tend, above all others, rightly to inform the understanding and to purify the heart: that the Views which have been offered respecting the Eternal World and State, are such as carry the highest evidence of their own reality, and impress the reality of the things be-

longing to that world and state in the strongest manner on the human mind ; and that the opinions which have been advanced respecting the accomplishment of the Second Coming of the Lord and of the Last Judgment, with the raising up of a Human Instrument for making them known, are precisely what Prophecy, rightly understood, should lead mankind to expect, and what Experience and Fact, — the experience, in our day, of the whole world, and facts which press upon the observation of all, — irresistibly confirm. And even such of you as, not yet venturing to put your minds under the direction of the Lord Jesus Christ, but looking for light to some different source, shall not be convinced that these sentiments are true, must yet, I trust, be satisfied, that both our doctrines and ourselves have been greatly misrepresented, and are in general much misunderstood ; that our doctrines are not altogether undeserving of attention, and that those who hold them are not altogether deserving of contempt. As to what is thought of ourselves, however, we desire to be indifferent ; but the sincerest charity compels us to wish, that mankind may be led to think less unworthily of what, we are satisfied, is the Truth. But this also, we are instructed, will, sooner or later, be the case. For though it is agreeable to divine prediction, that, at the time of the Second Coming, “they should make war with the Lamb,” — should oppose the belief of the Divinity of the Lord’s Humanity and of his oneness with the Father, with the other truths then to be made known ; yet the same prediction assures us, that “the Lamb shall overcome them,” — shall convince them, from the Word, of their mistake : “for he is Lord of lords, and King of kings.”* Happy, assuredly, are they, who yield to his dominion ! Thus, happy are they, by whatever denomination they wish to be called, who practically admit the first two essentials of the New Church, prefigured, as we believe, by the New Jerusalem ; which are, — The acknowledgment of the Lord in understanding and in heart ; and, A life according to his commandments.

* Rev. xvii. 14.

APPENDIX.

No. 1. — SECT. VI. — PART V.

Various Particulars relating to Heaven and Hell, &c., Explained.

WE will here as promised above, p. 366, pass under review the eight-and-twenty "*Sundry Extracts from the Writings of Baron Swedenborg*," which the writer I have chiefly followed in this Work has adduced, as supporting his charges against the Author. The more general subjects brought forward in these extracts have been examined already above, Sect. VI. Part V., and I trust it has sufficiently appeared, as there observed, "that, when considered with reference to their proper causes, and to the nature of man after death, of the circumstances in which he is placed, and of the appearances around him, all the facts must be allowed to be in perfect harmony with the statements of Scripture, and with the dictates of reason, — that the true ground of offence must be admitted to exist solely in the unfounded prejudices of our opponents, — in the vague, shadowy conceptions, which, in the acknowledged absence of all specific knowledge, they had formed for, and from, themselves." "Being, however," as there also observed, "desirous that every thing which our enemies censure as objectionable should be viewed in the fullest light," we will here consider the remainder of those *Sundered Scraps*. The extractor has prefixed to most of them a ridiculous or reproachful title; as, however, they all present some beautiful and important truth, I shall review them under titles more in accordance with their genuine character.

1. *The state of a particular Class of Evil Spirits; and Origin of the two different modes of representing Satan in Pictures.* This is one of the *Memorable Relations*, introduced by Swedenborg by way of appendix, to the chapters of his work, entitled, "True Christian Religion, or the Universal Theology of the New Church," by way of illustrating the doctrinal subjects discussed in the body of the work: It occurs at n. 261; and it is of such length as might seem to exclude it from the class of *Sundered Scraps*, were it not that the explanations of the nature of appearances in the spiritual world, and of the laws of that world in general, which the author gives elsewhere, are necessary to be known, to enable the reader to form a correct judgment of some of the particulars which it details. The design of it, as stated by its Author, is, "to mention some circumstances relative to the state of those who have confirmed themselves from the Word in false principles of doctrine, particularly of those who have been induced to do so, for the sake of defending the doctrine of justification by faith alone." All the particulars in it which could give offence, have been explained in Sect. VI., Part V., the most "curious" are specifically alluded to in p. 355: and, when rightly understood, the whole is calculated to be felt as most solemnly and affectingly impressive. The opponent has cited it, apparently, for the sake of supporting his allegations as to the mildness of the hell described by Swedenborg. But it is to be recollected, that this is not a description of the fate of those who in this world have been flagrantly wicked, but of those who have passed through life with the character of men of piety, including many ministers; but who, having confirmed themselves in the notion that salvation is by faith alone, have inwardly thought lightly of evils, and have not abstained from them from a principle of religion, but merely from external morality, or perhaps only to save appearances. The state of those who in this world have lived in the practice of flagrant crimes, and have confirmed them in their spirits as allowable, such as robbery, cruelty, adultery, and the like, and the punishments which overtake them, are described by Swedenborg in the first volume of the *Arcana Coelestia*, in colors sufficiently terrible to come up one would think, even to this adversary's conceptions of the torments of hell. And even the general statement by which the relation we are now no-

ting, so objectionable to the extractor for its mildness, is concluded, is such as must appear sufficiently appalling to all who retain any just feelings, and who do not think that the life of a hog or of a filthy reptile, is desirable and inviting, because, by the hog or the reptile, its disgusting habits and filthy domicile are felt as congenial to its nature. "With respect to the hells in general," says the Author, "they consist merely of such caverns and workhouses, but differing according to their inhabitants, whether they be satans or devils. They are called satans who have lived in false persuasions and consequent evils, and they are devils who have lived in evils and consequent false persuasions. (None, it is to be observed are in hell on account of having merely entertained false persuasions, but only when they have applied them to confirm themselves in evils). "Satans appear, in the light of heaven, pale and livid, like corpses, and in some cases of a darkish hue, like mummies: but the devils appear, in the same light, of a fiery, dusky complexion, and in some cases black like soot. But the forms and faces of them are all monstrous; and yet in their own light, which is like that of ignited charcoal, they do not appear as monsters, but as men: which appearance is conceded for the sake of consociation." We here see the origin of the two very different modes of representing Satan, and evil spirits in general, which have been adopted by painters. Some represent them under the most horrible forms that can be conceived: this results from their having a perception that their real forms—that form which they have when viewed in the light of heaven, which discovers things as they are in their true nature,—must be the form of their own evil. Others paint them with a sort of unlovely beauty; following the idea of Milton, who believing Satan to have been originally a superior angel, says, that in hell

—— "his form had yet not lost
All her original brightness, nor appeared
Less than arch-angel ruined, and the excess
Of glory obscured;" —

and this results from their having a perception, that in their own light,—a light corresponding to their phantasies and false persuasions, which "call evil good and good evil,"—they can assume a less offensive appearance. Both modes of representing them give confirmation to the statement of Swedenborg.

2. *Infatuation, in the other life, of Irreligious Philosophers.* Our accuser's second extract (from T. C. R. n. 80) is headed, "*A farther Account of Hell*;" but this is not a true description of it, as it does not give an account of hell, but of the discourse of a Satanic spirit in the world of spirits. Had it been related as a fictitious narrative, and not as a real fact, it would certainly have been commended as an admirable exposure of the absurdities inherent in the persuasions of those *philosophers* who ascribe all things to nature. And what can in reality be more awful than the assurance, that when such false persuasions have been confirmed by an evil life, they remain in the other life, and are then carried to the extreme of infatuation? and that although the spirit, before he is dismissed to hell, is convinced of his folly, still, when he returns into his own inherent state, or into his own proper life which is a life, of lusts and phantasies, he forgets the instruction he had received, and plunges farther and farther into the insanity of his infatuations? (It may be useful to state, that there is an error in the translation of a sentence in this relation, as quoted in the Anti-Swedenborg, p. 91, which has been corrected in the last edition of the work from which it is taken. The satan, on being for a moment convinced of his infatuation, is represented as saying, "I have certainly lost my senses: I have seen heaven above, and heard the angels conversing there, in words and on subjects inexpressible, *as I was lately wandering near this place.*" This last clause ought to be, "*but this was when I had recently entered this world.*" It refers to the knowledge which is given to every one in the other life, before he is judged to his final abode, respecting the real nature of heaven and of hell, and of his own state). This relation appears to have been quoted by the adversary, and called "a farther account of hell," farther to support his accusation against Swedenborg, of making hell inviting: though, if this Satan did not appear, at the time very unhappy, it is to be remembered that he was not, at the time in hell, but permitted to emerge for a specific purpose; hence, too, it was, that he seemed to be on so good terms with his female companion, both being, at the time, in a state of their *externals*, comparatively. The whole exhibits a picture of moral degradation that is truly appalling. But moral deg-

radiation has in it nothing repulsive in the estimation of the accuser; physical tortures are the only things which can prevent, as he thinks, hell from being attractive; why then did he not give an extract from the article immediately preceding that which he has there selected? An account is there given of some evil spirits, who, in the world of spirits, followed a path which led to hell; and it concludes thus; "Forasmuch as their delight was to do evil, and they did evil to many in the way, they were put into a prison, and became demons; and then their pleasure was turned into pain, because they were restrained from the indulgence of their former delights, which constituted their nature, by punishments, and by the dread of punishment. And they inquired of those who were confined in the same prison, whether they were to remain there forever; to which some replied, We have now been here for several ages, and must continue here to ages of ages; because the nature which we contracted in the world cannot be changed, nor expelled by punishments; for though it be by them expelled for a time, yet after a short interval it returns." Why did not the accuser include this in his extracts, when he begins one at the very next line to it? Clearly, because it would not answer his purpose; because it would have shown, that when he was representing the hell of Swedenborg as an abode of "comfort,"—as a place to which it might be worth "going on speculation,"—he was wilfully falsifying the truth.

The four next extracts are sundered scraps in every sense. They are taken from a relation of the Author's in the Appendix to one of the chapters in his *Tr. Chr. Rel.* (n. 731—752). In this relation the Author describes how very gross and erroneous are the notions entertained of heaven by great numbers who pass by death from this world into the world of spirits; which unfounded conceptions must necessarily be removed, before even those who may be capable of becoming angels can be introduced thither. Among other modes of correcting these misapprehensions, one is, occasionally, after preparing them for the purpose, to take up into heaven, for a few days, some persons from the temporary societies in the intermediate region or world of spirits, in order that, on their return, they might make their companions acquainted with what they had learned of heaven from their own experience and observation; and an arrangement more worthy of Infinite Wisdom and Goodness cannot, surely, be conceived. The relation in question contains the narrative which ten persons, who had thus been prepared and taken up into a *society of the lowest heaven*, gave on their return. But of this necessary preliminary information, the extractor gives nothing.

8. *Distinctions, in Heaven of Dress, and of Rank.* The first scrap taken from this relation (T. C. R. n. 743) is headed, "*The dress of the inhabitants of heaven:*" but this is a misnomer, as what follows is not an account of the dress of the inhabitants of all the societies of heaven, among which there is, as may be supposed, an indefinite variety, but of one society only, in which, as being a society of an inferior heaven, there was more approximation than in the generality to the dresses used on earth. What is meant to be held up to ridicule in the dress described, does not appear. The extractor, I suppose, must think it right that angels should appear in some dress; then why not some of them in this? Perhaps he is displeased that the chief of the society should appear with "a kind of zone, or ribband, with the ensign of his society; the ensign was, an eagle sitting on her young at the top of a tree." But how common is it in almost all writers to regard the various orders and bands of angels as distinguished by various insignia! Thus in the following passage of his description of the assembled angelic hosts, Milton only embodies in few words what many others have both thought and said;

"Standards and gonfalons, 'twixt van and rear,
Stream in the air, and for distinction serve;
Of hierarchies, of orders, and degrees;
Or in their glittering tissues bear emblazed
Holy memorials, acts of zeal and love
Recorded eminent." P. L. v. 599, &c.

Or is he displeased that there should be in heaven distinctions of rank? though this too is quite in agreement with the popular belief. Angels have always been considered as marshalled into *hierarchies*, or holy governments; and if, instead of Swedenborg's calling the chief of this society *the prince*, he had called him *the archangel*, the meaning of which would be precisely the same, perhaps all difficulties would have vanished. To perplex the case a little, the

extractor calls the prince of this single society, "the prince of heaven;" as if Swedenborg held that the whole of heaven was subject to some prince other than the Lord. Watts also supposes there to be "governments," and various "ranks" and "stations" in heaven.

4. *Heavenly Music; and the Exalted Nature of all External Enjoyments in Heaven.* The extractor heads his next selection (T. C. R. n. 745), "*Amusements, pastimes, &c. in heaven.*" All the particulars it mentions, we have vindicated in Section VI. Part II., except that we have not noticed what it states respecting angelic music and singing; for this, surely, can be thought by none to require vindication. Who that is not quite destitute of "music in his soul;" who that is at all capable of being "moved by concord of sweet sounds," or by the heavenly affections to which they correspond, can help being affected by the following description, and feeling that such singing is truly heavenly? "Every morning, from the houses round the public buildings, are heard the most sweet songs of virgins and young girls, which penetrate through the whole city. Some one affection of spiritual love is sung every morning; that is, is expressed in sound by modifications of the singing voice, or modulations; and that affection expressed in the singing is perceived as the affection itself, flowing into the minds of the hearers, and exciting them to a correspondence with it. Such is the nature of heavenly singing." Did the accuser cite this to convince the reader, that Swedenborg's ideas of heaven are unheavenly, or his own? The extract here given is from a discourse with the strangers respecting "such of the joys of heaven as affect the bodily senses," considered distinctly from "what renders those joys satisfactory and happy." The latter subject is treated of both in the paragraph preceding, and in that following, the one presented; which is thus a carefully sundered scrap indeed. As what is there delivered is most undeniably and sublimely heavenly, wherefore it did not suit an accuser's purpose to quote from it, we will in some degree supply the deficiency. The visiting strangers were persons who had previously supposed the joys of heaven to consist chiefly in bodily pleasures; wherefore in the prince's discourse with them, he is represented as making these remarks: "What are the delights of the bodily senses without the delights of the soul? It is the soul which inspires them with delight. The delights of the soul (or inmost part of the human and angelic nature) are in themselves imperceptible beatitudes; but as they descend into the thoughts of the mind, and thence into the sensations of the body, they become more and more perceptible. In the thoughts of the mind they are perceived as satisfactions (*faustitates*), in the sensations of the body as delights (*jucunda*), and in the body itself as pleasures (*voluptates*). Eternal happiness is derived from the latter and the former taken together, but from the latter alone a happiness results, which, not being eternal, but temporary, is quickly ended, and passes away, and sometimes is turned into unhappiness. Ye have now seen that all your joys are joys of heaven too, and far more excellent than you could possibly have conceived; but yet such joys do not inwardly affect our minds. There are three principles which enter, by influx from the Lord, as a one, into our souls: these three as one, or this trine, are love, wisdom, and use. Love and wisdom, of themselves, only exist ideally, being confined to the affections and thoughts of the mind: but in use they exist really, because they are then together in the act and operation of the body: and where they exist really, they also subsist. Since then love and wisdom exist and subsist in use, it is use which affects us: and use consists in a faithful, sincere, and diligent discharge of the duties of our functions. The love of use, and the consequent application to it, so keep together the powers of the mind as to prevent their dissipation: thus the mind is secured from wandering about at random, and imbibing all the lusts which flow in, with their enchanting delusions, through the senses, from the body and surrounding objects, by which the truths of religion and morality, with all that is good in either, become the sport of every wind: but an application of the mind to use, keeps in and binds together those truths, and arranges the mind into a form receptive of the wisdom thence derived; when it extirpates from its outer circumference the idle ridiculous sports of falsities and vanities" (n. 744). Are not these the dictates of solid heavenly wisdom? And connected as it is by the writer with this account of the true source of heavenly joy, and of that which imparts to external joys their capacity of affecting the angels with delight, does not all that is said of the latter become also truly rational and heavenly?

5. *Immaculate Purity of Heavenly Society.* The extractor gives this (T. C. R. n. 749) under the title of "*A Curious Case in Heaven.*" The ten visitors, who, it is to be remembered are not angels, and, as yet, far from being such, are introduced to six virgins, who like all in heaven, were of indescribable beauty. On approaching the strangers, however they instantly withdrew; and on being questioned as to the reason by the angel who attended the strangers, they said, "We do not know: but we perceived something which repelled and drove us back again." The strangers then confessed, that on the sight of such beauties they had felt somewhat as men are too apt to do at the presence of beautiful females on earth: and this it was which was perceived by the angelic virgins, and which repelled them, though they themselves knew not the cause. Is the anecdote ridiculous? Does not rather this little incident give a more exalted idea of the purity of heavenly society than could have been conveyed by the most labored description? The beauty of the female angels immensely exceeds all that imagination can conceive: the male angels freely enjoy their society: yet were the least improper emotion to arise in their bosoms, the innocence of the females would instantly perceive it, and it would drive them away! What innocence and chastity must reign where this never happens! Yet he who paints such innocence and chastity as inhabiting the breasts of angels, is charged, by the grossness of his accusers, with giving gross ideas of heaven! (It is to be observed, in addition, that, owing to the statement's being given as a mere sundered scrap, the parties who had the improper feelings might be supposed to be angels themselves, which is contrary to the truth.)

6. *An Account of a Marriage in Heaven* (T. C. R. n. 747) (so headed by the Extractor), being one of the scenes to which the visitors were admitted. To this narrative, when it is believed that the institution of marriage really does exist in heaven, as has been shown in Sect. VI. Part IV., it will be difficult to raise any objection. Every thing related is in the highest degree becoming, and suitable to the place and the occasion. In the relation from which the account is taken, it is followed by a paragraph in which the significant circumstances are explained: but this, with his usual caution, the extractor omits.

7. *Conjugal Cold.* Some of the statements in the writings of Swedenborg are thought objectionable, merely because the terms used for expressing them are with difficulty translated into the English language, in such a manner as to retain the idea intended and yet be agreeable to the idiom of our tongue. "Conjugal Cold," a translation of the Author's *frigus conjugiale*, is a phrase which certainly does not sound very agreeably to our ears. The term *conjugal* was adopted by the translator of the work *De Amore Conjugiali*, in preference to *Conjugal*, for reasons which he has assigned in his preface, and which we need not here consider. But whether the phrase "conjugal cold" be pleasing or not to our ears, the thing meant by it has unhappily, but too certain an existence; as many a neglected wife can testify. By it, the author means, that feeling of coldness or indifference towards their wives, which too often invades the breasts of men in the married state. The extract is a relation from the Appendix to one of the chapters in the work on *Conjugal Love* (n. 270), to illustrate the question, "In what region of the human mind doth love truly conjugal reside; and thence in what region doth conjugal cold reside?" In it, the mind is representatively exhibited under the image of a house or palace with its various apartments; and the subject of inquiry is beautifully illustrated by other symbolic appearances. The whole conveys a highly pleasing idea of the delightful manner in which instruction on the most recondite subjects is communicated by corresponding appearances in the spiritual world; and the appropriateness of the images to the things intended to be expressed is adapted to strike every mind, not disposed to scoff at every thing truly heavenly and angelic. That a house is constantly mentioned in the Word of God as an appropriate symbol of the mind, must be obvious to every attentive reader of the sacred pages.

8. *Of the Jews in the Spiritual World.* (T. C. R. n. 841). The relation, of which a part is extracted under this title, is such as must be allowed to wear the most striking aspect of truth, by all who are aware, that man after death is still a man, and that the circumstances in which he finds himself are in exact accord with the state of his heart and mind. By those who have had opportunity of observing what the Jews are in this world; and who also believe, what reason and Scripture would teach all to believe, that the habits of thinking and feeling which a man has confirmed in himself by the whole course of

his life in this world follow him into the other, and that death does not miraculously transform a man into a being altogether dissimilar to his former self, but only strips off all that does not properly belong to him, and displays him such as, in his veriest self, he is ; — by all who are acquainted with these facts, the account of the Jews in the spiritual world must be allowed to be as truly reasonable as it is faithfully characteristic. It is to be observed, however, to prevent misconception, that nearly all which is here related of the Jews refers to their state in *the world of spirits*, where all first appear after death, and not to their final states in *heaven or hell*. Nothing also, can be more reasonable, than the means affirmed to be employed, to bring them, where practicable, to the acknowledgment of the Lord, particularly respecting the occasional appearance to them of an angel, whom they believe to be Moses, who “admonishes them to desist from the folly of expecting the Messiah, as if he were still to come among them ; representing to them that Christ, who governs them and all other creatures, is the Messiah ; that he, Moses, knows this to be true, and that, while in the world, he had knowledge of him.” In short, the whole evinces, that, though man cannot but remain after death such as he had made himself by his life here, means are there provided by Divine Mercy to lead all, who by their life here, have acquired any capacity for it, to heaven and the Lord ; and that even Jews, low as their rank is among the families of the human race, are not, by the mere circumstance of their being Jews, excluded from salvation. In the original, two paragraphs are added which are omitted by the extractor, but which greatly add to the verisimilitude of the relation. They exhibit the manner in which the unconverted Jews adhere, in the other life, to their notions about the future coming of their Messiah and their own return to the land of Canaan. In the *Intellectual Repository*, vol. iv. p. 210, &c., is an account of an interview which Mr. Hindmarsh once had with a party of Jews ; and the answers he obtained from them, on the subjects respecting which the sentiments held by them in the spiritual world are here related, present a coincidence with the statements of our author which is not a little remarkable.

9. *Of Divine Influx into Man.* (H. & H. n. 251). This extract states, that the influx from the Lord into man passes through the forehead, and so into the whole face (meaning, the *forehead and face of his spirit*) ; and that of the spiritual angels (or those in whom intellect predominates) takes place into that part of the head which is occupied by the *cerebrum*, that being the portion of the brain which is the seat of the intellectual faculties ; whereas the celestial angel (or those in whom love predominates) act upon the part of the head which is occupied by the *cerebellum*, that being the portion of the brain which is the chief seat of man’s will and love. The statement may probably appear rather strange to those who do not seriously think that man is the subject of any “influx” at all : but those who, in agreement with the Scriptures, believe that man lives by an influx or communication of life flowing into his soul from moment to moment from the Lord, and that the Lord employs the angels in dispensing his gifts, who are “sent forth to minister unto them who are heirs of salvation ;” will see no reason to ridicule the statement. Many philosophers have now adopted the belief, that the distinct faculties of the mind have distinct parts of the brain as their proper organs ; if this be true, if it be at the same time admitted that man is the subject of influences from angelic beings ; and if it be believed also that there are distinct classes of heavenly beings, suited to the “many mansions” of our heavenly “Father’s house ;” it then becomes certain, that the good influences experienced in each of our various mental faculties must come immediately from that class of angelic beings in whom that faculty, in all its excellence, forms the predominant characteristic. It cannot, indeed, be reasonably doubted, that the “many mansions” of our heavenly “Father’s house” are equal in number to the distinct faculties of the angelic mind, which is the same as the human mind ; that they exactly, in fact, correspond to each other ; and hence that the “influx” by which each faculty of the human mind is directed to its proper use comes from the specific heavenly “mansions” which corresponds to it, and the inhabitants of which are pre-eminently distinguished by it. As then all the human faculties are distinguishable into two general classes, — those of the understanding and will, — it will follow, that the same is the case with the angelic hosts in general, and that it is not without meaning that the Scripture speaks of the Lord’s “angels” who are “spirits,” and of “his ministers” who are “a flame of fire” (Ps. civ. 4) : and it follows again, that the one class of angels operates chiefly on man’s will,

and the other chiefly on his understanding, and thus upon those organs of his frame which are the seats of those faculties of the mind. As to the influx from the Lord into man's forehead and face, this is stated in the extract to be, because "the forehead corresponds to man's love, and the face to the interiors of his mind;" and that they have such a correspondence, and thence have such a signification in Scripture, will appear to any one who examines the passages where they are mentioned. Now whether from this correspondence and signification of the forehead and face, the influx from the Lord does or does not affect in a peculiar manner the face of man's spirit, let those judge who recollect what stress is laid in the Word of God on a man's *setting the Lord before his face*. Every one intuitively has an idea of a good man as having his face turned towards the Lord, or having the Lord before his face, and of the contrary as being the case with a wicked man; and this is the origin of the numerous phrases in use among religious people respecting *conversion* and being *converted*. Whence can all this be, but because the influx of the Lord with his divine life of love and wisdom into man, in a peculiar manner affects the face of his spirit, and thus turns it, in those who receive that influx, towards himself? And to ridicule this, is in reality to ridicule the numerous passages of the Word of God which speak according to the appearances derived from this fact. Swedenborg does not mean to state that the face of man, considered as to his spirit, is the *seat, or receptacle*, of the influx of life, which flows into him from the Lord; but that, *because the face corresponds to the interiors of his mind*, the influx from the Lord into the interiors of the mind in a peculiar manner *affects his face*, and gives it the aspect of being turned towards Him. As the Lord is omnipresent; and as, also, in the spiritual world, there is no real space, but only the appearance of it: this perpetual turning of the angel's face to the Lord, so as to be in the direct reception of the rays of love and wisdom which beam from Him as the Sun of righteousness, by no means restrains the freedom of his motions; he can change the position of his motions; he can change the position of his body as he pleases; but in whatever direction he turns it, he still has a perception of the Lord as being before him. Thus what Swedenborg says respecting the influx from the Lord into man's forehead and face, is clearly founded in Scripture, and in the very nature of things.

10. *Origin of the Uncomfortable Mental Feelings attendant on Indigestion:*—quoted under the title of "*Curious Account of Anxiety and Grief*." (H. & H. n. 299). This is a paragraph from a most instructive chapter "On the Conjunction of Heaven with the Human Race," and on man's connection with spiritual beings in general: but to understand some things contained in it, two former chapters also should be studied, in which it is shown, "That there is a Correspondence between all things of Heaven and all things of Man," and, "There is a Correspondence between Heaven and all things of the Earth." Viewed in connection with what is there developed, the present scrap, "curious" as it may appear in its sundered state, would be found in agreement with reason and truth. Its purport is, that when undigested food lies long in the stomach, certain spirits of an evil nature, who are of a quality corresponding to such impure substances, are capable of being near the man as to his spiritual part, from whose presence, though unperceived, arises a sense of anxiety and melancholy. Thus simply propounded, the statement may perhaps appear "curious;" yet, even thus, it assuredly is not more curious than the persuasion of the medical faculty in general and of most others; who believe that the state of the stomach exercises a direct influence on the state of the mind, and this without the interference of any spiritual agency whatever! What rank materialism is this! Yet many who are not favorers of materialism in other respects cannot fail to adopt it, when they advert to a well known fact, and yet refuse to accept the explanation of it offered by Swedenborg. That protracted indigestion is accompanied with very distressing anxieties and depressions of mind, is universally known, and is experienced by multitudes in a very painful manner. Here is the indisputable fact. What can be the cause of it? Is the stomach the seat of the mind? or is there an "influx" from the stomach into the mind?—The thought is monstrous. Then how account for the fact, but by admitting the hypothesis of Swedenborg, being the only one by which the influence on the mind that undeniably operates in states of indigestion can be referred to a spiritual cause? According to his representation of the connection between the spiritual and natural worlds, every object and substance in the natural world affords a basis to such objects and actions of the spiritual

world as corresponds to its nature ; thus all clean and useful objects and substances yield a basis, in which, as it were, rest and terminate the spiritual spheres proceeding from the heavenly worlds and their inhabitants ; and all unclean and noxious objects and substances yield a basis, in which rest and terminate the spiritual spheres proceeding from the infernal worlds and their inhabitants. Consequently, when the work of digestion does not go on properly, but the contents of the stomach are in a disorderly state, they, like other unclean substances, will afford a basis in which rest and terminate the spiritual spheres proceeding from a certain class of evil spirits of a corresponding nature ; but as this is a basis within, and, in a degree, vitally adjoined to, the man himself, the spirits from whom such spheres proceed, are at the same time brought near to his spirit, whence they, and not his stomach itself, exercise an influence on his mind, and produce in him the sense of melancholy and anxiety. This is Swedenborg's view of the subject. By those who disbelieve the existence of any spiritual world, or of any connection between the spiritual world and the natural, or of any influence exercised by spiritual beings on the mind of man, it may be laughed at ; but by those who do not venture to contradict both Scripture and reason, by denying such things, it will be differently regarded. In any case it must be allowed, that to account for the otherwise unaccountable changes in the state of the human mind, from a spiritual cause, though states of the body may draw that spiritual cause into operation, is more philosophical than to reject the spiritual cause altogether, and to suppose a direct operation of matter upon mind.

11. *Public Worship, Preaching, &c. in Heaven.* (H. & H. n. 223). That Swedenborg's assertion, that there are public worship and preaching in heaven, should appear ridiculous to a preacher and conductor of public worship on earth, seems not a little extraordinary. We have seen above (p. 857) that the truly pious and judicious Watts fully believed that in heaven there must be both. On the supposition that such is the fact, what our author has said respecting it must be allowed to be worthy of the subject, and to require no vindication.

12. *Concerning the Hollanders in the Spiritual World.* (T. C. R. n. 804, 805). What was said on the extract respecting the Jews above, will in great part apply to this and to the next. It is to be remembered, that this description of the Dutch in the spiritual world only relates to their state *in the world of spirits, soon after they have left this world by death, and before they are prepared for their final states in heaven and in hell.* In the world of spirits, as is expressly affirmed in the first extract, all are arranged "according to their *natural* affections ;" such as these had been on earth ; hence their state in many respects is similar to what it had been on earth ; only they are then in the *interiors* of their *natural* affections respectively, whence their actions, circumstances, and the appearances about them, are all such as exactly correspond to their natural affections, such as these are in their intrinsic nature. Hence they exhibit there, and this by corresponding circumstances and actions, the very types of their natural characters, every thing extraneous thereto being removed. Let then any one, with this preliminary information, and possessing an accurate knowledge of the natural and national character of the Dutch, read what is here said of them, and, instead of deeming it ridiculous, any further than as some of the traits of that character itself may be deemed ridiculous, he will, I am satisfied, acknowledge it to be just, and to be characteristic in a very high degree. But, it is to be observed, that after a longer or shorter time, all pass from the state of their natural affections, or such as were proper to them in the world, into those properly belonging to their spirit, which are quite different from the former, though agreeing with them by correspondence. All the appearances about them are then entirely changed ; and those who only knew them in their former state would know them no longer.

13. *Concerning the English in the Spiritual World.* (T. C. R. n. 809, 810, 811). All that is said in the last article is equally true of this, which therefore requires no further explanation. Of the truth of the painting here, every one may judge ; and every one must acknowledge its exactness ; though what is said of the preachers of the doctrine of justification by faith alone, though strikingly characteristic, will, for that very reason be unacceptable to the adherents to that doctrine. The parts of the chapter which the extractor has suppressed are perhaps more obviously characteristic than what he has selected ; in particular, he has withheld the handsome tribute which is paid to the superiority of the English character among the nations of Europe ; which ought to afford

some recommendation of the author to the favorable attention of Britons. Though himself a foreigner, he speaks of the natives of this country as follows; "With respect to the people of England, the better sort among them are in the center of all Christians, in consequence of possessing an interior intellectual light. This, though not apparent to any one in the natural world, in the spiritual world is very conspicuous. They derive this light from their liberty of speaking and writing, and thus of thinking; while others who do not enjoy such liberty have that light presented in a confused manner, because it wants an outlet. There is among them a similarity of disposition, which leads them to an intimate connection with friends of their own country, but seldom with others. They are kind in relieving each other's necessities, and love sincerity. They are lovers of their country, and zealous for its glory," &c., (n. 807, 808.)

14. *Unfair "Specimens of Baron Swedenborg's Commentaries on the Book of Genesis."* This is a collection of carefully sundered scraps indeed. It is introduced with the learned complaint, that "the Baron has taken the liberty to new translate the text," that is, that, writing in *Latin*, he did not give the text of the *English Bible*! Some verses he then selects from chs. ii. and v. with the spiritual sense as first briefly subjoined by the author to each verse, *omitting all the explanations which are invariably added to illustrate and exhibit the grounds of the interpretation*, and when read in connection with which it will be found equally intelligible and just; yet, after having kept far the greater part of each article out of sight, the extractor is not ashamed to conclude with this sentence; "The above specimens may suffice to give a tolerable idea of Baron Swedenborg's *Arcana Cœlestia*; and many will, no doubt, think with the publisher of these extracts, that the commentaries are far more mysterious than the text." (p. 121). A tolerable idea, truly! Yes, these *sundered scraps* give just as tolerable an idea of the *Arcana Cœlestia*, as a skeleton gives of a man.

15. *Concerning the State and Nature of Man after Death: with a brief description of the Spiritual World.* (T. C. R. n. 792—794). All the statements contained in this extract have been abundantly vindicated in Section VI.

16. *None can abide in Heaven, who have not Heaven in their own souls:* given under the description of "An Angel cast down from Heaven for professing his belief in the Personality of the Son of God." (T. C. R. n. 110). This is one of the extractor's artful titles, by which he endeavors to convey such a false and unjust impression of what follows as may prejudice the reader at the outset. The spirit whom the extractor calls an *angel*, is affirmed in the relation itself to have been an *angel of the dragon*! and what he denominates "*professing his belief in the Personality of the Son of God*," consisted in his affirming, "*That God the Father and God the Son are two, and not one.*" (In the edition from which Mr. B. quotes, it is, "are not one, but two persons;" but in the last edition it is given as here, there being in the original no mention of *persons*). Now whether a spirit who actually believed the Father and Son to be two Gods, and in whom that belief was so confirmed by an evil life that he was incapable of receiving a better, could be tolerated in heaven, let the reader judge. Some, perhaps, may still wonder, how an *angel of the dragon* could have got into heaven at all: but this wonder will not so much affect the statement of Swedenborg as the statement of Scripture which he follows. John the Revelator informs us, that "there was war in heaven; Michael and his angels fought against the dragon, and the dragon fought, and his angels, and prevailed not, neither was their place found any more in heaven" (Rev. xii. 7, 8). But it has been shown in Sec. IV. above, (p. 151, 155) that the heaven here spoken of as occupied by the dragon and his angels, is not the proper heaven of angels, but a superior region of the intermediate world of spirits. Now as, after the judgment, such spirits no longer found a place there, it will follow, that any who might aspire thither would be speedily cast down. This appears to have been the case, in the instance before us: and then there remains no matter of wonder whatever. However, it is not impossible, according to Swedenborg's statements, elsewhere, for a spirit who is inwardly evil, but who yet believes himself entitled to heaven, to ascend thither for a short time, if he eagerly desires it, before he is consigned to his proper home. This is permitted in order to convince him how impossible it is for him to endure the sphere of the angelic abodes. The usual consequence is, that, the very atmosphere of the place being in utter contrariety to the quality of his life, he is immediately seized with a sense of suffocation; intolerable torments writhes his whole frame; and he

eagerly casts himself down. Hypocrites, however, who know how to assume the appearance of angels of light can sometimes endure it a little longer. That all this is agreeable to fact; that they who are not principled in the faith which has its origin in charity, may indeed intrude within the angelic abodes, but that they cannot remain there is plainly taught by the Lord in his parable of the wedding-feast; at which a man without a wedding garment appeared indeed among the guests, but was speedily cast out. See the remark on this circumstance in Sect. VI. p. 314.

17. *Clear Exposure of the Impossibility of the Resurrection of the Material Body*; cited with the assertion, that "*The following will show that the Baron, with all his faith and charity, could almost copy the language of Infidels.*" (T. C. R. n. 770). See above, p. 78.

18. *Swedenborg's Unaffected Mention of his call to his Office*; extracted under the title of "*Baron Swedenborg's Egotism.*" For what the extractor is pleased so to denominate, see above, pp. 264, 265, and the remark at top of p. 268, and then judge of the fairness of the description.

19. *Appropriate Corresponding Representations*; cited as "*the Harlot and the Dead Horse in the Spiritual World.*" (T. C. R. n. 277). The extractor has given this relation a title which only applies to one part of it, and that the smallest. A symbolic representation is described, in which, by the appearances customary in the spiritual world, is exhibited the nature of the Word both as to its natural and its spiritual sense, the free communication of knowledge thence to such as are in states to receive it and the falsification of its truths too generally prevailing at this day, whereby the right apprehension of the Word is lost. The causes and nature of the appearances have been sufficiently explained in Sect. VI, above; and the whole, I cannot but think, must be deemed beautiful and impressive by all those, of whose views of truth and apprehension of the Word a harlot and dead horse are not the proper symbols. Had it been Swedenborg, and not John the Divine, who relates the visions of the harlot of Babylon, and of the beast whose head was wounded unto death, the mirth of those who ridicule the present relation would, doubtless, have been unbounded.

20. *Concerning the Mahometans in the Spiritual World.* (T. C. R. n. 828, 830, 834). In these scraps we have marks of very careful picking and culling; and with good reason has it been exercised; for in the longest of the intermediate paragraphs (n. 833), the Author so strikingly and beautifully "*vindicates the ways of God to man,*" in having permitted the Mahometan religion to be so extensively established, that it would be difficult to read it without being convinced that it proceeded from a mind eminently instructed in the proceedings of Divine Providence. I have been assured from a person who was present, and who was too well acquainted with the subject to be liable to any mistake, that in a sermon at the Tabernacle for the Missionary Society, Dr. A. Clarke introduced the ideas contained in this paragraph, giving them, for the most part, in the very words of Swedenborg; and that their beauty so struck the hearers, as to be the subject afterwards of much observation and admiration: what would the admiring congregation have said, had they known whence they were taken? As to the passages which the adversary has selected, they require no explanation, after what has been said on his extracts respecting the Jews, the Dutch, and the English.

21 & 22. *Concerning Infants in Heaven.* Under this title are given two extracts from Swedenborg's Conj. Love, n. 410, 411, 412. All the particulars contained in them have been sufficiently explained in Sect. VI. p. 335, &c.

23. *Appropriateness of Swedenborg's Language to his Subject*, given as "*A Sample of Swedenborg's Learned Jargon.*" (Div. Love, and Wisd. n. 185). For so does this erudite and modest accuser intitle a scrap, which, when sun-dered, as it carefully is, from the explanations that precede and follow it, he judges, avowedly from his own experience, the ignorant may find unintelligible. The only "hard words" used in it, however, are *co-exist*, *continuous*, and *continuity*, *discrete*, *altitude* *latitude*, *prior*, and *posterior*; the meaning of all which may be found in any dictionary, though the extractor considers any composition in which they occur to be incomprehensible "jargon." Whatever he may think, it is not the use of scientific terms upon a profoundly scientific subject, where such terms alone are adequate to express the meaning intended, which gives to a composition the character of jargon; but the use of any terms whatever without meaning, or without appropriate meaning: and were I disposed to retaliate, I could adduce several passages from the accuser's book which strictly

come under the definition. In the extract in question, Swedenborg is speaking of two species of degrees according to which all things in the universe are arranged, and of the difference between which he was the first to discover, though the learned in general are now beginning to acknowledge the reality of the distinction. The nature of the difference between these two kinds of degrees is explained by the author in the paragraph immediately preceding that quoted, and which even this extractor did not venture to select as bearing the character of jargon. It is as follows: "The knowledge of degrees is like a key for the opening of the causes of things, and for affording admission into them. Without this knowledge, scarce any thing respecting the nature of causes can be understood. For without this knowledge, the objects and subjects of both worlds appear as simple, as if they contained nothing within them beyond what is obvious to the eye; when, nevertheless, this, respectively to what is within it bears the proportion of but one to two thousands, yea, to myriads. The things contained within, which are not obvious to the eye, can never be disclosed without a knowledge of degrees: for the ascent from things that are exterior to such as are interior, and by these to such as are inmost, is according to degrees,—not according to continuous degrees, but to discrete degrees. Continuous degrees are those by which objects decrease from coarser to finer, or from denser to rarer; or rather, by which they increase from finer to coarser, or from rarer to denser, as in light passing into shade, or in heat passing into cold. But discrete degrees are of a quite different nature. They are like things prior (or first), things posterior (or succeeding), and things postreme (or last); or like end, cause, and effect. These degrees are said to be discrete, because that which is prior exists distinctly, that which is posterior distinctly, and that which is postreme distinctly: nevertheless, when taken together, they form one whole. The atmospheres, as they pass from highest to lowest, or from the sun to the earth, and which are called ethers and airs, are distinguished into such degrees: in their different degrees they are like simple substances,—substances formed by the combination of several of the former,—and substances formed again by the combination of several of these; and these taken together, are called one compound substance. These degrees are discrete, because they exist distinctly: these are what we mean when we speak of degrees of altitude: but the former degrees are continuous, because they increase continuously [or slide from one into another by imperceptible gradations]; these are what we mean when we speak of degrees of latitude." Now whether or not this may be at once understood by the utterly unlearned, it will assuredly be admired by all the learned for the clearness with which it explains a subject in itself abstruse; and so far is any part of it from being jargon,—words without appropriate ideas,—that the ideas conveyed in it might easily be familiarly illustrated so as to be easily intelligible to the most ignorant also; though to do this would require many more than the few, and most appropriately chosen words in which it is here couched by the author. The same remarks are applicable to the paragraph selected by the accuser, after that here cited has, as intended by the author, been read first. (For proof that the learned of the present day are adopting the doctrine here delivered, see the *Intellectual Repository*, Second Series, vol. i. pp. 181, &c., where the subject is illustrated by copious extracts from Kirby and Spence's *Introduction to Entomology*).

24. *Angels descendants of the Human Race.* (Div. L. and W. n. 330). The doctrine delivered in this extract has been abundantly proved in Sect VI. Part II. This extract, though, a completely sundered scrap, is so obviously beautiful, (as, indeed, many of the others), that it is wonderful by what infatuation the extractor could think it calculated to promote his purpose. But his object in selecting the present beautiful passage, is evident, from his endeavoring, by printing part of it in Italics, to force upon that part a ridiculous meaning which the author never intended. What he has thus marked is a clause in which the author states, that *man cannot be rational unless his body be in a sound state*. But can the accuser seriously believe, that it is here meant to be asserted, that every derangement of the bodily frame destroys the powers of the mind?—that a hurt in the finger or the toe, for instance, will, in Swedenborg's estimation, deprive a man of rationality? It is sufficiently obvious from the passage itself, (and if it were not, it is abundantly evident from other parts of the author's writings), that his meaning is, that man cannot be rational, *when the part of his body on which the exercise of his rational faculties depends is not in a sound state*, as is the case in idiots and persons delirious or insane; and that

part is, not the leg or the stomach, nor even the lungs or the heart, but the brain. This is his plain meaning; and to insinuate the contrary, is to resort to an artifice, totally unbecoming a fair opponent.

25. *Swedenborg's explanation of our Saviour's praying to his Father.* (T. C. R. n. 110). This also is a beautiful extract. The subject is sufficiently explained in Section VII., Part II., and specifically at pp. 884, 885, 886.

26. *The Divine Power always exercised agreeably to Divine Order;* given under the description of "*God's Power of Redemption circumscribed by Baron Swedenborg.*" (T. C. R. n. 73). This is another of calumnious titles by which Mr. B. so often endeavors to excite unmerited odium against the object of his attack. The extract to which it is prefixed is truly a carefully sundered scrap. It is a single sentence taken out of the middle of a paragraph containing a closely connected discussion of three pages, and forming a sequel to a similar paragraph of three pages more; and the reasoning contained in the whole is so luminous and conclusive, as, had the extractor read it, must have convinced, one might suppose, even him. But, like many others, he has obviously turned over the pages of Swedenborg, not with a view of seriously weighing any thing they contain, but merely to look for such things as, when nakedly propounded, might be deemed "curious;" and as soon as his eye catches a paragraph, or even a sentence, which, taken by itself, he thinks likely to help the impression it is his object to make, he cuts it out of its connection, and presents it as a sample of the whole. Connected with what precedes and follows, the sentence here cut out only affirms, that God, notwithstanding he is omnipotent could not, *agreeably to the order which he himself has established*, have redeemed mankind without assuming human nature, and raising this to complete union with his Divine Nature, in the manner in which these divine works were actually accomplished; for in the context it is shown, that the omnipotence of God is never exercised in an arbitrary manner, but always according to the laws of his own divine order. To affirm this, however, is, in our accuser's estimation, to circumscribe God's power of redemption. According to him, the appearance of the Lord Jesus Christ in our nature, with his sufferings, death, and resurrection, were by no means necessary to the redemption of mankind, but man might have been saved just as well had Jesus never been born. "To bind God with the chains of his own order, appears, to him, as to certain other objectors, "great wickedness," and "opposed to his omnipotence." In short, "God's power is circumscribed," according to this theologian, if we suppose him to act from any principle of order, or from any other impulse than that of whim and caprice. Whether the holder of such notions has any right to hold up Swedenborg to derision for advancing the contrary,—for believing, in particular, that infinite order and infinite wisdom, together with infinite power, were displayed in every step of the work of human redemption, let the Reflecting decide.

27. "*Christ's sitting at the Right Hand of God explained by Baron Swedenborg.*" (T. C. R. p. 186). And a most beautiful and obviously true explanation it is. See it vindicated above, pp. 414, 415, 416.

28. *The Apostles sent forth in the Spiritual World to preach the Gospel.* (T. C. R. n. 791). If, as is so probable, and so congenial to the conceptions of the most intelligent men (as we have seen in Sect. VI. pp. 838, 884, 885), there are employments in the heavenly world, varying according to the genius of the heavenly spirits, and their acquirements formed by their habits in the world; and if, according to the opinion and language of Dr. Watts there cited, there is preaching in that world, and "lectures of divine wisdom and grace given to the younger spirits there by spirits of a more exalted station;" then are not these precisely the employments in which we should most naturally suppose the apostles to be engaged? Accordingly, Dr. Watts scruples not to conjecture that such is the fact, and adds to the apostles the prophets also. "You will perhaps say," he remarks, as if again he were addressing this accuser, "that we shall have no need of their teaching when we get to heaven; for we shall be near God himself, and shall receive all immediately from him. But hath the Scripture anywhere excluded the assistance of our fellow-spirits? God can teach us here on earth immediately by his own Spirit, without the use of books and letters, without the help of prophets and ministers, men of like passions with ourselves; and yet he chooses rather to do it in an instrumental way, and makes his creatures in the lower world the means of our instruction under the superior influence of his own Spirit. And why may he not use the same methods to communicate knowledge to spirits that newly arrive at that upper

world? There we shall see the patriarchs of the old world, and prophets of the old dispensation, as well as the apostles and evangelists of Christ and his gospel. — There Paul and Moses shall join together to give us an account of the Jewish law, and read wondrous and entertaining lectures on the types and figures of that economy, and still lead our thoughts to the glorious antitype with surprising encomiums of the blessed Jesus. Paul shall unfold the dark places of his own writings, better than he himself once understood them; and Moses shall become an interpreter of his own law, who knew so little of the mystery and beauty of it on earth himself." (Vol. ii. pp. 425, 426). Now when Swedenborg affirms, only that part of what Watts here so confidently anticipates is true, is it to be deemed less credible, than when proposed with so many additions by Watts? But the scene of the specific preaching of the apostles mentioned by Swedenborg, is not in heaven, but in the intermediate region or world of spirits. We have however, amply seen, in Sect. IV., Part III., that this intermediate region was to be the scene of the last judgment, and, of course, that, at that time, great and extraordinary operations were there to be accomplished. One of these operations, it is declared by the Lord himself, should be "the sending of his angels, who should gather together his elect from the uttermost part of the earth, to the uttermost part of heaven." (Mark xiii. 27). Is there the least improbability in supposing, that at least among these angels might be the twelve apostles? And how were they to ascertain who were the elect, and to gather them together? What means so likely, as by proclaiming the gospel of the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, — by announcing the fact, that he had taken to him his great power, and would reign, as the only God of heaven and earth? Thus, in every point of view, there is much that confirms the probability of Swedenborg's statement on this subject; and nothing on which the shadow of an argument can be raised against it. But it will not be generally believed, so long as the inward incredulity which is now so general in regard to the existence of any spiritual world whatever, continues to exert its torpifying influence on the human mind. Where this prevails, and among those in whom it does not break out into open denial, it is all very well to talk of such things, so long as they are only proposed, as by Watts, in the way of conjecture and speculation: suggestion thus offered may be admired as ingenious, pretty, and plausible: but rise from the language of conjecture to that of knowledge; affirm that the views proposed are not to be played with as the creations of fancy, but to be acted upon as the realities of fact; and the inward spirit of incredulity at once rises in rebellion, shuts the mind against the admission of the thought, and proceeding from rejection to aggression, pronounces with dogmatism, that what appeared beautiful regarded as a fiction, is absurdity when regarded as a truth.

With this remark, I conclude my examination of the extracts from our author, given in the Anti-Swedenborg. I trust it will be seen by the generality of those whose minds are not entirely closed by a confirmed state of such incredulity, that all the statements which have been noticed, are perfectly in accordance with the assertions of Scripture, and with the dictates of reason also, when Reason is aware of the two truths which Scripture and Reason equally testify, that man after death is a real man as before, and that all the circumstances in which he then finds himself, are outward expressions of his inward state. It must also be seen by all, that however I may have succeeded in the vindication of the extracts, the manner in which they have been selected by our adversary is in the highest degree partial and unjust; — that they by no means afford a fair opportunity of judging of the writings of the illustrious Swedenborg.

But I have one other remark to make, which is perhaps of some importance: it is, *That even they who may be of opinion, that such statements as some of those which we have been considering, had no other origin than the imagination of the writer, will not be justified, on this account, in rejecting, indiscriminately, the whole of his writings.* I have known several, whose prejudices against supernatural communications were so strong, that they could not believe the reality of those of Swedenborg; who yet were immediately satisfied, on looking into his works, of that the greatest injustice is done him in the estimate formed of him by the religious world at large; and who became fully convinced of the truth of his general views of doctrine. It can absolutely be denied by none, that in all his writings are delivered sentiments of the highest importance, proposed and discussed in the most luminous and truly rational manner, and with a clearness of evidence which those who are not deterred from seriously attending to it by

extraneous considerations, find it very difficult to resist: is it then the part of a rational man, under the influence of merely extraneous considerations, to refuse to avail himself of what is indisputably excellent, and to reject the whole for what he regards as a blemish in certain parts? On the supposition that those parts are merely the offspring of imagination, they must have been the products, not of a light or disordered mind, but of a mediation so profound, that the subjects of it occasionally became embodied as realities. If, also, the having received such impressions, whether real or not, is a sufficient reason for rejecting the whole of his writings, and sentiments, with them must be rejected the writings and sentiments of many others, who were regarded with the highest esteem in their life-time, and who have since retained, and retain still, a large share of influence over the opinions of mankind. Even deists have been of this number. The story of Lord Herbert of Cherbury is well known; who was encouraged, as he believed, by a supernatural appearance, to publish his book against the Christian religion. Among the great geniuses who arose on the revival of learning, few were more distinguished than the celebrated Cardan. This man believed, and most solemnly affirms, that he had frequent communication with spirits: yet none of the learned allege this as a reason for rejecting his writings *in toto*, or for refusing to look at the valuable things which they are admitted to contain. Abundance of similar instances might be adduced; but I will content myself with that of the famous Luther. If we are not to accept the doctrines of the New Church, because their propounder avers that he had spiritual communications; we ought never to have separated from the Church of Rome, because the greatest of the Reformers asserts the same thing. Many statements respecting Luther's supernatural intercourses, contained in his own works, might be quoted: but we will take a specimen of a *Memorable Relation* of his from his book *De Missa Privata et Unct. Sacerd.* [It may be seen complete in the edition of his works printed at Wittenberg in 1588, tom. vii. p. 479. In the latter editions some parts of it have been omitted; but I have ascertained that it is contained, with only the omission of the words describing the devil's voice, in the copy of Luther's works in the library of the Royal Institution, tom. vii. p. 228].

"Awaking from a sound sleep a few nights ago," says Luther, "the devil, who, I assure you has made me pass many an uneasy one, began to speak to me as follows. 'Listen to me, O learned man! Do you know that, for these fifteen years, you have been in the daily habit of saying private masses: Now what if all this time you have committed daily acts of idolatry, and, instead of the body and blood of Christ, have adored and exhibited to others to adore, nothing but plain bread and wine?' I instantly replied, 'I am an anointed priest, ordained by a bishop; I acted according to the command of my superiors: why then should I not be said to have truly consecrated, as I pronounced the words attentively, and said mass most devoutly?' 'Very true,' said the devil; 'but the very Turks and heathens perform their rites in their temples from a principle of obedience, as well as you. But what if your ordination and consecration were both false, like that of the Turks and Samaritans?' Here," says Luther, "my heart began to beat, and the cold sweat to ooze out from every pore. The devil put forth his whole argumentative force; and *he has a deep and strong voice*. Nor can such an altercation continue long; on the contrary, question and answer pass in an instant. It was then I plainly perceived how it sometimes happens that people are found dead in their beds. He can destroy the human frame when and where he chooses: nay, so oppress the soul as to force it from the body, as he has often nearly done mine; so that I am convinced both Empson and Ecolampadius were killed in this manner; for no human being, unassisted by God, can withstand it." — He goes on to relate, at considerable length, the remainder of the dispute; and what is not a little extraordinary, he gives the devil the right side of the argument, and is convinced by him of the idolatrous nature of private masses.

Now that there was some illusion in this statement of Luther's will be generally thought. Admitting there to be any reality in it whatever, it certainly was not the devil, considered as the sovereign of hell, with whom he held the conversation; nor was it with all hell, considered as one aggregate power, in which sense *the devil* is spoken of in Scripture. According, however, to Swedenborg's statements, it is by no means impossible that some spirit or other discoursed with Luther on this occasion, whom he, judging of the case from his own previously formed opinions, might suppose to be *the devil*. But even on

the supposition that it was an evil spirit, or a devil, the relation is very incongruous: the sentiments delivered are by no means in perfect accordance as is strictly the case in all Swedenborg's relations, with the imputed character of the speaker. But let the incongruity be ever so extreme; or even supposing the whole, as will now be the judgment of most, to be the mere offspring of imagination; will any assert that the writings of Luther are therefore to be rejected altogether? that it was absolutely wrong, under such a guide, to forsake the Romish communion? that it is impossible justly to regard him, as he has been hitherto extensively regarded, as an extraordinary instrument in the hands of Providence for good? They who hesitate at coming to such conclusions in regard to Luther, ought to beware how they adopt similar ones in regard to Swedenborg. This observation would be true, were his statements equally incongruous: much more is it true, when, as just remarked, there is none of his Memorable Relations which does not wear much more of the character of consistency and probability than does this Memorable Relation of Luther's.

The case altogether stands exactly thus:

Luther affirms that he had supernatural communications, of which he relates many instances:

Swedenborg affirms that he, also, had supernatural communications; and he gives such explanations of the nature of the spiritual world, and of man as possessing a spiritual part as well as a natural part, as clearly account for his own spiritual experience, and for Luther's also:

Luther, notwithstanding his relations of his supernatural communications, is regarded by all Protestants as entitled to the utmost respect as a theological leader and writer:

Consequently, Swedenborg, whose writings on no subject are less rational than those of Luther, and on many are far more so, is entitled to at least an equal degree of respect from the Christian world.

The above relation, with other similar statements, has lately been published by the Catholics as a tract, under the title of *Martin Luther's Conference with the Devil*, by way of throwing ridicule on Luther and the Reformation: in exactly the same manner as our opponents, by their "Sundry Extracts," endeavor to throw ridicule on Swedenborg and the New Church; and if these succeed in their object, the Catholics most certainly, ought to succeed in theirs.

I only add, to prevent misconception, that while in these last paragraphs I have reasoned upon the supposition, that Swedenborg's statements respecting his spiritual intercourse might only originate in imagination, I by no means intend to admit that in my own estimation, formed from an examination of all the circumstances of the case, there is any possibility of such having been the fact. And though I am of opinion that they who think so, may, nevertheless, read his writings with advantage, I am satisfied that few of those who shall thus come to the conviction that his writings are true in part, will fail to conclude in the end, that they are true altogether.

NO. II. SECTION VII. PART IV. P. 413.

The New-Church Doctrine of the Trinity, not a Revival of Sabellianism, or any other Ancient Heresy.

A VERY common mode of attempting to throw odium on the doctrines of the New Church, is that of giving them the name of Sabellianism, or some other long exploded error. Thus after stating, in his way, our view of the Trinity (as given above, p. 378), the writer I chiefly follow proceeds thus:

"If there were any merit in the authorship of this anti-scriptural doctrine, yet, even then it would not fall to the share of the Baron, for the very same doctrine in substance was broached and propagated in the third century by an arch-heretic of the name of *Noëtus*, and whose followers were called *Noëtians*, and also *Patripassians*, because they said the *Father suffered* in the body of Christ for the sins of all mankind. After this arose another sect bearing some resemblance, though somewhat different, under the denomination of *Sabellians*, being the followers of one *Sabellius*." (P. 10).

Here are two things to be observed: first, that in bringing this charge against us, the objector includes in it a statement, which, indeed, is an essential part of it, but which totally exculpates us from it: and, secondly, that the same statement shows, that in all that is really erroneous in the doctrine of Noëtus and

Sabellius, the charge may be truly made against modern Tripersonalists in general. The statement alluded to is, that they were called "*Patripassians*, because they said that the *Father suffered* in the body of Christ for the sins of all mankind."

It is true that the Sabellians and Noëtians, and also the still earlier Praxeans, were justly called *Patripassians*, and that for the reason stated by the objector; and this evinces that their doctrine was most essentially different from ours; for it has been amply shown in Section VII., that in no sense whatever do we hold that the *Father suffered*. Such an idea is, to our apprehensions, shocking and blasphemous in the extreme. We have seen, however, that modern Tripersonalists in general, if they do not believe that the Father, as the first person of their Trinity, suffered, do believe this of the Son of God from eternity, the second Person of their Trinity, co-equal and co-eternal with the Father: thus if not *Patripassians*, they are strictly *Deopassians*;* and all the absurdity and blasphemy of Patripassianism belongs to it, not as Patripassianism, but as Deopassianism; that is, it belongs to it, not as affirming that the Father suffered as a Divine Person distinct from other Divine Persons, but as affirming that the Father suffered as God. The monstrosity of the doctrine consists in its imagining that God could suffer. From this absurd and shocking idea the doctrines of the New Church are completely free: in those of Tripersonalism it is retained in all its deformity and extravagance.

Our opponents will, perhaps, wish to escape from this imputation: it shall, therefore, be established by an authority which they admit,—that of the celebrated Mosheim. As, of the three ancient "Arch-heretics, the sentiments of Noëtus come the nearest to our views, I will extract a statement of them from Mosheim's most copious work on Ecclesiastical History,—his *De Rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum Magnum Commentarii*; in which he treats of these subjects far more particularly than in his well known Ecclesiastical History, translated by Dr. MacLaine.

"The doctrine of Noëtus," says our learned author, "so far as it can now be made out from the writings of the ancients, was this. I. The clearest declarations of the sacred oracles establish beyond all dispute, that beside that God who is called the Father of all things, there is no other. II. But they who divide God into Persons, multiply their Gods, or out of one make many. III. Therefore, that distinction of persons in God ought to be rejected as false. IV. But the divine books declare with equal clearness, that God was in Christ, and that Christ is that supreme God, from whom proceeded all things. V. To reduce, then, the two classes of declarations to agreement, it is necessary to believe, that the God who is in Christ, is the supreme God himself, whom the sacred books call the Father of the human race. VI. That Father, in order to succor fallen men, procreated of the Virgin Mary, a man free from all fault, who, in a peculiar sense, is called the Son of God. VII. The Father joined that man to himself, in such a manner, that of himself and that Son was formed one person. VIII. On account of this conjunction, whatsoever things befel that Son, or that divinely begotten man, are also rightly attributed to the Father, who had associated him to his own Person. IX. The Father, therefore, thus joined to the Son, was born, suffered punishment, and died. For though the Father, considered in himself, can neither be born, nor die, nor be tormented, yet, since he made the Son one person with himself, he may be said to have been born and to have died. X. For the same reason, although the Father present in the Son continues to be the Father, he is also rightly called the Son."

By this statement of Noëtian doctrine, so clearly given by Mosheim, we find that it contained great truths mixed with great errors. Through the first six or seven articles the reasoning is irrefutable, and the conclusions certain; but from thence to the end all is as erroneous. The origin of the error lies here: that neither Noëtus, nor any other theologian before Swedenborg, perceived, that the union between the Divine and Human Nature was not complete, but only in incipency, at the time of our Lord's birth,—that it was in progress during the whole course of his life in the world, and was only finished by his death and resurrection; thus, that it is literally true, as declared by the Apostle, that he was "made perfect through sufferings." For want of perceiving this truth, though it stands so obviously extant in the sacred writings; and thus supposing that the union of the Divinity and the Humanity was complete from the very birth of the latter; Noëtus and the other ancients, who denied the tri-

* A *Deopassian* means one who holds the doctrine of a suffering God.

personality, were ~~driven~~ to the necessity of admitting, that the Father, or the whole Godhead, suffered in the Humanity of Jesus Christ; and Tripersonalists have in like manner been compelled to suppose, that, though not the whole Godhead, a third part of it, — the Son of God from eternity, — a God co-equal and co-eternal with the Father, — actually thus suffered. From what inextricable embarrassments, then, are we relieved by the New-Jerusalem doctrine, of the progressive union of the Divinity with the Humanity, and of the gradual glorification or deification of the latter!

But with all its errors, the doctrine of Noëtus is greatly superior to that of Tripersonalism; since this retains all the errors of the former in addition to its own. This is actually acknowledged by Mosheim, though himself a very orthodox Tripersonalist. Take his remarkable words: "This doctrine," says he, meaning that of Noëtus, "does indeed take away the mystery of the Divine Trinity [meaning Tripersonality]; but it does no prejudice either to the person or to the offices of the Saviour Christ, and is far preferable to the Socinian doctrine, and all that are like it. It also is not more repugnant to reason, than that which affirms that it was a Divine Person (the second Person of the Trinity) which joined the man Christ to himself; say, by establishing the most simple unity of the Divine Nature, it seems to come nearer to the dictates of reason." Mosheim afterwards notices a remark of Beausobre's, who, because Noëtus admitted the Divine Nature to be impassible in itself, concluded that he could not hold as affirmed of him, that the Father suffered. "He could not," says Beausobre, "without the extreme of folly, have said, that one and the same God was impassible, and yet suffered." On this Mosheim observes, it is truly astonishing that this eminent writer did not recollect, that *what he calls the extreme of folly, is precisely what the great body of Christians profess every day; namely, that that God, who, by nature cannot suffer at all, did in Christ suffer the punishment owing by man to God; that is, that the sufferings of Christ's Human Nature did also belong to God, who was joined to this Nature by the closest and most indissoluble union.*"*

For popular evidence, that *the great body of Christians do profess every day what Beausobre justly calls the extreme of folly*, — the notion that God himself suffered on the cross, — take the following extracts from the Hymns of Wesley, who has never been charged with want of orthodoxy:

"Where is the King of glory now,
The everlasting Son of God!
Th' Immortal hangs his languid brow;
Th' Almighty faints beneath his load."

(Hymn 24.)

"The earth could to her centre shake,
Convulsed, while her Creator died."

(Hymn 25.)

"The Immortal God for me hath died,
My Lord, my Love, is crucified. —
Come, see, ye worms, your Maker die!"

(Hymn 28.)

"Sion, thy suffering God behold!"

(Hymn 149.)

"Lo! the powers of heaven he shakes;
Nature in convulsions lies;
Earth's profoundest centre quakes:
The Great Jehovah dies!
Dies the Glorious Cause of all!
Well may Sol withdraw his light,
With the sufferer sympathize;
Leave the world in sudden night,
While his Creator dies! —
Mourn th' astonished hosts above:
Silence saddens all the skies:
Kindler of seraphic love,
The God of angels dies!"

(Hymn 552.)

Contrast the foregoing pictures of the Sufferer at the Crucifixion, with the following from the New-Church Hymn Book, and say which is most rational as well as scriptural:

* Mosheim's De Rebus, &c. pp. 685, 686, 687.

APPENDIX.

" Now Satan triumph'd ; ' Now,' he cried,
 ' Who shall my power oppose ?'
But when the *Son of Mary died*,
 The *Son of God arose*.
He finished with his dying breath
Redemption's grand design :
His *Manhood bare our sins to death*,
And then arose *Divine*."

(Hymn 82.)

Thus then we find, even from the admission of a learned Tripersonalist, that it is wrong to charge us with being Noëtians or Sabellians, since we utterly reject the notion which procured for them the distinguishing name of *Patripassians*; that most unjustly is the charge made by modern Tripersonalists, who themselves hold the error which, in the former name, is imputed to us, being themselves *Deopassians* as truly as were the Noëtians; and that, were the charge against us as true as it is false, our sentiments would still be more consonant to reason than those of the Tripersonalists, because not destroying, as theirs do, the real unity of God. Of the three doctrines, ours alone has no inconsistencies. That of the Noëtians is burthened with inconsistencies from which ours is free. That of the Tripersonalists retains all the inconsistencies of the doctrine of the Noëtians, and adds to them others equally great beside. Far indeed, then, are our adversaries from obtaining any triumph over us, when they throw upon us the unmerited reproach, of holding the doctrine of Noëtus or Sabellius.

The doctrine of Sabellius deviated farther from ours, and approached nearer to that of the Tripersonalists, than did that of Noëtus; but it is not very important to point out the distinction. They are generally regarded as the same; and when our adversaries ignorantly charge us with Sabellianism, they mean by it the doctrine which is explained above as that of the Noëtians.

FINIS.



NOTICES OF THE FIRST EDITION OF THE "APPEAL."

*From the Intellectual Repository, vol. 2, Second Series, p. 382,
in a Letter addressed to the Editors, signed "FRATER."*

' If ever it was desirable to impress the Members of the New Church with a favorable idea of any publication in illustration or defence of her doctrines, *this* is one which possesses a peculiar claim to your unqualified approval and most earnest recommendation Who cannot fail to admire the accumen with which it analyses the statements and arguments of its opponent; and the keen discrimination and manly spirit with which it detects and overthrows his empty sophistries and artful subterfuges, and refutes his disgraceful calumnies and misrepresentations Nor is the appeal more distinguished by its victory over this Goliath, than by its merits as a general defence of our church and her doctrines; by the vigorous intellect, sound learning, and literary talent, which are displayed in its criticisms, arguments, and illustrations; and by the numerous and valuable collateral testimonies which it contains to the truth of some of our most important doctrines, collected in the course of the author's extensive reading and indefatigable research Such being my conviction of the value of this work, (in common with all with whom I am acquainted), I must confess, that it appears to me that *now* we shall not stand in need of any further defences of our doctrines."

From the Minutes of the Nineteenth General Conference, p. 24.

This "work is a manly defence of all the leading doctrines of the New Jerusalem, and a lucid exposition of their real nature and tendency. It furnishes an able exposure of the calumnies and prejudices which so often intercept the progress of truth, and contains a clear and satisfactory explanation of those subjects relating to the spiritual world, which are generally so grossly misrepresented by the opponents of the New Church. Altogether, it affords valuable assistance to those who are desirous of vindicating their faith, and of opposing the influence of error and misrepresentation."

SUMMARY STATEMENT

....OF THE....

DOCTRINES

....OF THE....

NEW JERUSALEM CHURCH.

—o—

I.—God is One in Essence and in person, in whom there is a distinct and essential Trinity, called in the Word the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and the Lord Jesus Christ is the God, and the only true object of worship.

II.—In order to be saved, man must believe on the Lord, and strive to obey his commandments, looking to Him alone for strength and assistance, and acknowledging that all life and salvation are from him.

III.—The Sacred Scriptures, or the Divine Word, is not only the Revelation of the Lord's will and the history of his dealings with men, but also contains the infinite treasures of his wisdom expressed in symbolical or correspondential language, and therefore in addition to the sense of the letter, there in the Word an inner or spiritual sense, which can be interpreted only by the law of correspondence between things natural and things spiritual.

IV.—Now is the time of the Second Coming of the Lord, foretold in Matt. xxiv., and the establishment of the New Church signified by the New Jerusalem in Revelation xxi., and this Second Coming is not a visible appearance on earth, but a new disclosure of Divine Truth and the promulgation of true Christian Doctrine, effected by means of the Lord's servant, Emmanuel Swedenborg, who was specially instructed in this doctrine, and commissioned to publish it to the world.

V.—Man's life in the material body is but the preparation for life, and when the body dies man immediately rises into the spiritual world, and, after preparation in an intermediate state, dwells in Heaven or Hell, according to the character required during his earthly life.

VI.—The Spiritual World, the home of men after death is not remote from this world, but in direct conjunction with it, and we are, though unconsciously, always in immediate communion with angels and spirits.

